

THE ORDER AND THE CIGAR-MAKERS.

CIRCULAR AND STATEMENT BY THE GENERAL EXECUTIVE BOARD, TOGETHER WITH THE TESTIMONY RECENTLY TAKEN CONCERNING THE TROUBLE GROWING OUT OF THE LOCK-OUT DECLARED ON FEBRUARY 18, 1886, BY THE UNITED CIGAR MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION OF NEW YORK.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., July 2, 1886.

To the Order everywhere, Greeting:

The General Executive Board has decided to issue the following circular that our members may fully understand the exact position of the Knights of Labor and its relation to the International Cigar-makers' Union.

On March 3d, Messrs. Strasser, Kirchner and other officers of the International Cigar-makers' Union met with the General Executive Board, in Philadelphia, and made complaint that unfair people were organized into the Order. After an all-day session on the case, we promised, as soon as time and opportunity would permit, to go to New York, make an investigation, and, if proven that such charges were well founded, to revoke their charter, for this organization will not be made a refuge for unprincipled and unfair people.

The first act of Mr. Strasser after leaving us, and before his complaint could get any consideration, was to issue a letter and mail it to Brother Powderly in New York City, when he was positive Powderly was still in Philadelphia; all of which proved conclusively that he had no confidence in the proposed investigation vindicating his complaints. The letter was dated March 6th, and may be found in the minutes of the special session of the General Assembly, page 30.

Since the date of the above letter, Mr. Strasser and his colleagues have been constantly sending circulars and men through the Order to boycott all goods except those bearing their International blue label, and have charged the General Master Workman and the balance of the General Executive Board with co-operating in the organization of scabs into the Order.

The officers of the Cigar-makers' International Union knew when they were flinging their charges broadcast that there were upwards of 60,000 members of

the Knights of Labor and trade unions engaged in a life and death struggle for living wages. The Southwest strike was in progress. And at that time, when it was the plain duty of every man (with a spark of union feeling in his breast) to stretch forth the hand of sympathy, the chief officers of the Cigar-makers' International Union (to their eternal shame be it said) refused to exercise a moment's patience, and violated every principle of unionism by charging on our rear, while the militia of Illinois, in obedience to the order from corporate wealth, were drowning the cry of the oppressed in the roar of musketry, and feeding the hungry with cold lead and steel. Such conduct cannot be explained. Nowhere in the history of the labor movement does its parallel exist. But one reason can be assigned for the unaccountable actions of the officers of the International Union, and that is that men who indulge to excess in the use of intoxicants cannot transact business with cool heads. On two occasions the men who came to Philadelphia to confer with the General Executive Board were too full for utterance. The General Executive Board has never had the pleasure of meeting with Mr. Gompers when he was sober.

What these men expect to accomplish by their acts and efforts to destroy the Knights of Labor is hard to understand, the Order being the power that has made it possible for their Union to prosper.

All offers made in the interest of peace and harmony were rejected and scorned by the officers of the International Union, saying their Constitution will not allow them to work with Knights of Labor who are not members of the International Union. We then requested them to change their Constitution so as to enable them to receive our cards on equality.

We have never discriminated in the past in favor of our label as against theirs—only asked that our members see that cigars bear a union label, assuring them that the goods were made by honest labor. The position we have always occupied, and still adhere to, is that our cards be received on an equality with theirs; that our members be allowed to work in shops under the control of the International Union, and *vice versa*. In other words, we are willing to place our organization, with its hundreds of thousands of members, on the same footing with their organization, containing but 18,000.

Up to the present we have not said or done anything to the injury of this Cigar-makers' Union; neither do we intend to lay a straw in the way of the success of that or any other organization. But, in defence of the Knights of Labor, and our actions as General Officers, it is necessary that the Order should hear a full statement of the facts bearing on the case. With that purpose in view, we have compiled a full and complete review of all the facts elicited through the investigation made by the General Executive Board as to the cause of the trouble and complaints made by the Executive Officers of the International Union, a copy of which is mailed with this. And we trust that every person in the Order will read this statement, so that if the Inter-

national Union charge that we are organizing scabs, rats or black sheep, the Order and its officers can be defended.

The pressure of duty upon the Board made it impossible to go to New York until March 13th, when Brothers Hayes, Bailey and Barry left Philadelphia. The investigation was begun on March 16th, after due notice had been given to the parties interested. It was continued with intervals until near the meeting of the General Assembly on May 24th, when we were compelled to close the case, notwithstanding that the Representatives of D. A. 49 had not been fully heard—a fact which, nevertheless, is of little moment, as nearly all the testimony directed against that District Assembly was merely based on hearsay evidence.

Knights of Labor must not boycott goods bearing either the blue seal or white label of the Order. This order is imperative, and must be obeyed.



T. V. POWDERLY,
FREDERICK TURNER,
JOHN W. HAYES,
W. H. BAILEY,
T. B. BARRY,

General Executive Board.



REVIEW OF THE TESTIMONY.

On January 2d, 1886, the United Cigar Manufacturers of New York City, consisting of sixteen shops and employing 6,000 hands, posted a new price list which effected a considerable reduction in the prices paid previously. This excited, as might have been expected, much opposition on the part of the employees, composed of members of the Order, International Cigar-makers' Union, Progressive Union and non-unionists. No one intended to put up with the reduction; the only difficulty seemed to be in getting united action. The two Unions had for a long time been engaged in a Kilkenny-cat fight, and any means by which one could get the better of the other appeared justified. Each Union for itself and the devil take the hindmost had hitherto been the practice; consequently, neither trusted the other.

This fact alone would have justified not only the interference of the Central Labor Union of New York, but especially of the Executive Committee of D. A. 49, under whose jurisdiction one of the Cigar-makers' Locals, (No. 2814,) and many others interested in cigar-making, belonged. As a matter of fact, however, the District took no action until the trouble was at an end.

On January 4th, Progressive Union No. 1 wrote to the different Locals of the International, asking for a conference with a view to united action, as follows:

*To Progressive International Union No. 10, Cigar-makers' International Union of America,
Fred. Haller, Secretary:*

GENTLEMEN:—The undersigned was instructed, in a special meeting of the Executive of Union No. 1, Cigar-makers' Progressive Union of America, held on January 3, 1886, to request all cigar-makers' and packers' organizations of this city to take united action in regard to the revised price list of the Manufacturers' Association. We, therefore, send this request to your body also. Hoping that you will recognize the necessity of united measures in this important question, I remain yours, fraternally,

L. JABLINOWSKI, *Corresponding Secretary.*

P. S.—Address all correspondence to 156 East Fourth street.

No answer was received except from No. 10, to the effect that they would oppose the new price list, but no action could be taken until the affiliated Unions had been consulted, as follows:

NEW YORK, Jan. 6, 1885.

MR. LUDWIG JABLINOWSKI, *Secretary Cigar-makers' Progressive Union No. 1:*

SIR:—Your favor of the 4th inst. received. I am instructed to say that Union No. 10 has decided to oppose the price list offered by the manufacturers, but, being affiliated with the Cigar-makers' International Union of America, is bound by the Constitution of that

organization; hence can take no definite action on the matter before us until it has been passed upon by the affiliated Local Unions. I am, respectfully,

FRED. HALLER, *Corresponding Secretary.*

On January 13th a joint committee of the Central Labor Union and Progressive Union had a conference with the International Union Committee. This conference had little result, except that the Internationals informed the other representatives that their Union intended to call out the workers in Levy Bros.' factory, and deal with the whole trouble alone; or, as a witness puts it, that the International was the *only* Union in the cigar-making trade, and no one else had anything to say about it!—an assumption which was evidently not admitted by the Progressives and Central Labor Union, for before the conference was broken up an understanding was arrived at that nothing should be done by one side unless the other members were notified. [See testimony in behalf of the Progressive Union and Knights of Labor, also Herman's testimony.]

Two days afterwards Levy's shop (where the two Unions were nearly equal) was called out by the Internationals, who requested the Progressives to call out Love's, a strict Progressive shop with over 500 hands. The latter naturally objected to this proceeding, as it would have compelled them to pay all the strike benefits. Instead, Brown & Earle's was struck, where the Internationals had a portion of the hands. The workers in both shops endorsed these calls. Not so, however, those in Love's, which the Internationals afterward attempted to strike, but unsuccessfully. On the morning of January 15th, the International Strike Committee did actually proceed to confer with the manufacturers. The evidence goes to prove that this conference was intended to be secret, without the knowledge of the Progressives or Centrals. The latter committees, nevertheless, discovered that such a meeting was to be held, and were present. The only result was a notification on the part of the manufacturers that, unless Levy's and Brown & Earle's shops were supplied with hands, a lock-out would be declared in three days. The lock-out was declared in all the shops of the United Cigar Manufacturers on January 18th. Just previous or after this event the Internationals actually did enter into an arrangement with Kerbs & Spiess, (where there was only *one* member of their Union,) by which the shop was made strict International Union, which meant that no one but an International could work there. Many who refused to join the Union were discharged, including eighty Progressives and three hundred non-unionists. It is asserted by witnesses, and not contradicted, that the shop was organized by the aid of police and foreman, who bulldozed those that remained into joining the Internationals. A week later the Strike Committee of the Internationals paid a secret visit to the house of Mr. Oppenheimer, of Levy Brothers, and made overtures to make a similar arrangement with his shop. [See Mr. Oppenheimer's affidavit.] Another conference was held

between the two Unions at about this time, but it came to nothing, as the Internationals refused to consider a Union shop one in which either Unions had control or worked—a proposition similar to the one made by representatives of our Order. The Internationals would not recognize the cards of any organization but their own. They were in favor of peace, of the lion lying down with the lamb, but the lamb must be inside of the lion. The Progressives rightly conjectured, therefore, that the Internationals were more intent on wiping them out than on the general welfare of the trade or getting the better of the manufacturers.

The lock-out had continued about two weeks, when the manufacturers issued a public notice requesting a settlement by arbitration, at which no serious attempts had been made up to this time, notwithstanding there were two Local Assemblies of our Order connected with the two Unions, and members of the Strike Committees passed for Knights. It was perfectly proper, therefore, that the manufacturers' proposition was met half way by the Central Labor Union and Progressive Committees, who held a conference with the manufacturers at the Grand Union Hotel on February 5th. It is asserted on the part of the Internationals that their committee had no notice of this meeting, while a Progressive witness positively testifies to the contrary. Be that as it may, and it would appear that the Internationals had forfeited by their previous conduct all claims to any recognition whatever, the Grand Union conference was *the first bona-fide effort at arbitration*, and resulted, after two attempts, in a settlement, ratified by the great majority of the hands in the sixteen shops locked out. It was agreed that there should be a readjustment or equalization of prices in all the sixteen shops, on the basis of prices paid prior to January 2d, 1886, before there was any trouble. This equalization was effected under the supervision of the two Strike Committees of the Central Labor Union and Progressive Union and the different Shop Committees. The admitted result was that the prices were actually raised in all but three shops—Levy's, McCoy's, and Brown & Earle's, where there was a slight reduction. Even in these, it seems to be shown that the lowering only took place on cigars which are made to but a limited extent; that *the average prices are as high as those which obtained before the reduction, and as at present ruling in Kerbs & Spiess'*, which is a strict International shop.

The lock-out was declared at an end on February 12th to 14th by the committees of the Central Labor Union and Progressive Union and by the United Manufacturers' Association, respectively. In all the shops, except the three above mentioned, all the hands went back to work, including the Internationals. The three shops were struck by the International Committee, (which had no hesitation in allowing the acceptance of the new price list in the other shops, thus virtually consenting to it,) and, as a consequence, the International hands refused to return. All the other hands resumed work, including the packers. The asser-

tion that the latter were forced by D. A. 49 to go back is cut out of the whole cloth. The statement is simply based on alleged hearsay testimony. It was told to them by the packers, testify the International Union witnesses. Why was not a single one of these packers produced as a witness? As it is admitted that the packers (of No. 2) did not join the Order until after they had resumed, it is ridiculous to presume that the District Assembly officers had any authority over them sufficient at least to "bulldoze" them.

This was the status of the three shops at the time of the lock-out:

	Prog.	Int.	Non-union.
Levy's.....	50	70	180
McCoy's.....	120	45	400
Brown & Earle's.....	150	50	100
Total.....	320	165	680

There were 6,000 employees in the sixteen shops, of which the three shops had but 1,200, and of these the Internationals controlled but a very small proportion. If this was a fair measure of their strength in the city, it shows how presumptuous was their assumption that they alone represent the cigar trade, or that the higher prices paid were owing simply and solely to their efforts.

It is given in evidence that the rates they had allowed their men to receive in many of the other shops were actually lower than the new uniform rates. The fact is that the "International Union prices" were only a myth—a club to be used by their leaders to advance their own ends and to knock out their old enemy, the Progressives, with whose quarrel, of course, our Order has nothing to do, and whose merits we are not called upon to decide.

The trade (whether International Union, Progressive Union, or non-unionist) had no regular prices, and one of the greatest advantages of this new list was that it established a standard by which it is possible to judge whether a man is a scab or not—something which should not be left to the dictum of a few ambitious leaders. It fixed a minimum rate of \$7 per 1,000, "and in that price," testified a member of the Central Labor Union Committee, "we raised a good many cases." The manufacturers were also induced to concede the eight-hour system—a question of much more moment than one of mere wages. The agreement was, further, a direct result of arbitration, a principle for which our Order has always contended.

So much for the direct result of the equalization of prices agreement, with which the Knights of Labor as such had nothing whatever to do. But we do claim credit for an indirect yet most important outcome of all this hubbub—that is, the abolishment of the tenement-house system and child labor; something which the Unions had been unable to effect for twelve years. This was the work of D. A. 49—the credit alone belongs to it; and if the disadvantages of the compromise had been considerably more than they really were, the sacrifice would not have been too great.

The new price list had permitted tenement-house work; but a week after the

lock-out had been declared off, the United Manufacturers expressed a wish to obtain the Knights of Labor label, which they were told could not be had unless they gave up the vicious tenement-house cigar-making and the employment of children under sixteen years of age. Under the existing condition of things the shops would also have to become Knights of Labor. To this the manufacturers consented, and on February 25th, over a week after the original trouble had been declared settled by the Progressives and Centrals, the hands in the different shops were regularly proposed, elected and initiated into their respective Assemblies, strictly according to the rules of the Order. [See Wolf's testimony.]

The testimony of all the witnesses (except where it is merely hearsay tattle) goes to prove that D. A. 49 had nothing whatever to do with the men in the so-called three strike shops until after they had gone back to work under the new scales of prices; *i. e.*, after the trouble had been settled to the satisfaction of all but the officials of the International Union and its side-show, L. A. 2458, and the 165 Internationals of these shops—one-eighth of the workmen. Even Herman, one of the International Union Strike Committee, answering to the question whether the 1,300 hands who had returned to work in Levy's, McCoy's, and Brown & Earle's entered the shops as Knights of Labor, said: "No; they entered as scabs. They went to work first, and were initiated afterwards."

The trouble was and is that these International officials fondly imagine every one who does not train under their banner to be scabs, even though they may be actually working for higher rates.

"Does the International Union consider all shops not under their control scab shops?" was asked Mr. Kirchner, a member of the Executive Board of the International Union. [See Kirchner's testimony.] And the reply was:

"There is no declaration in the laws of the Union to that effect, *although we hold so*, and some of us can ride as high a horse as some of the [Knights of Labor.]"

Well, the Knights of Labor don't hold so, and do not intend to sit at the feet of either of the Unions for instruction—organizations which, combined, comprise not even a majority of the trade. The officers of the Order are anxious to see wage-earners the country over paid the highest possible remuneration, and will condemn "scabbing" wherever practiced. But we do not intend to accept that definition of a scab which a minority of a trade may see fit to decide upon. We shall insist, too, that what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. If scabbing is to be gauged by the relative lowness of prices, then all those shops where the Internationals work or have worked for a less scale than the highest paid in the trade are scab shops, and the employees, including the Internationals, scabs. And it is a fact abundantly proven by the testimony that the International had no regular scale of prices

for goods made in New York City; but there was a difference of from \$1 to \$1.50 paid in their various shops. Just here another point. The most contemptible scab is the one who indirectly encourages low-priced labor, which is tenement-house work in the cigar trade. If we can rely on Mr. Oppenheimer's statement, to the effect that he knew jobbers to hold a large number of International labels, which they placed on tenement-house cigars, those labels must have been furnished with the knowledge of the authorized agents of the International Union, *for a consideration!* This is all abundantly substantiated by evidence laid before the General Executive Board and reported to the General Assembly special session at Cleveland. [See page 29 of minutes.]

All this shows the claim to orthodoxy by the International Union is no better founded than that of the Progressive. Both carried on a cut-throat warfare. They cared nothing for each other's rights, nor those of the cigar-makers at large. Where one side could by some hokus-pokus get control of a shop, all who would not cry quits and join their Union got their walking papers. Old members of our Order were discharged because they would not go into the International, or strike against men of their own Assembly. To get men, they even falsely asserted that it was necessary to become Internationals before Knights of Labor, and the leaders in this work were the officers of L. A. 2458, which was run entirely in the interest of the International, to which all its members belonged. For a long time the total membership only consisted of fifteen, (mostly officers in the International Union,) and was kept up simply and solely for the purpose of allowing their first love to obtain the white label, to be used when it was found expedient. The General Executive Board had in its possession boxes of cigars manufactured by International shops, where no Knights were employed—for example, Kerbs & Spiess—and on one of these boxes the Knights of Labor and blue labels appeared together. [See General Executive Board's report, page 29, of General Assembly special meeting, 1886.]

These sham Knights of L. A. 2458 even went so far as to boycott our label. [See the testimony of Zeiger.] When it became necessary for the International to have certain shops Knights of Labor so as to get hold of the white label, this Assembly rushed in new members, in utter disregard of the laws of the Order, the International paying the fees besides. [See testimony of Wolf, Mirsky, Miss Buhl and others.] Suspended members of L. A. 2814 were allowed to attend the meetings. [See Sommer's testimony.] The Local well deserved its name, for its members set at *defiance* all the rules of the Order. Its Master Workman, Dampf, openly boasted at a public meeting that they did not care a rap for anybody in the whole Order, but would take any one they pleased into their Local—referring to the intention of initiating bookers and strippers, notwithstanding these had their own trade Local. So another, Brother Gompers, of this same Local, in connection with Haller, a suspended member of L. A. 2814, and the International Union President, followed up

this declaration with a statement at another public meeting, held in New York, that D. A. 49 and L. A. 2814 were composed of scabs, and that the Knights of Labor were mixed up with the International. [See Wolf's testimony.]

Another Master Workman, of L. A. 2458, who is also Secretary of the International Union, in his examination, at the Astor House, in this way answered the questions by the Board: "If the General Assembly sent you an order to resume work, would you do it?" "That is a queer question to ask. As a member of the International Union I would obey it, and as a Knight of Labor I would also—I believe I would."

Although Master Workman for several months, he did not know how many members his Local had at the time of the strike, merely observing: "I don't like to answer a question unless I have some knowledge of it." [See Brother Davis' testimony, March 16th.]

And so these examples, to show that L. A. 2458 was International first, last and all the time, might be multiplied. The Order was simply used as a cat's paw to draw International chestnuts out of the fire. We didn't need or want such allegiance, and L. A. 2458 was accordingly suspended on March 31st, 1886, and the General Executive Board so reported, to the General Assembly at the special meeting, May 28th, 1886. [See page 29 of minutes.]

Not content with the fraudulent use of our label, the officials of the International Union, who included the Strike Committee, and represented also L. A. 2458, used every method to boycott our Order and its label, and to cast odium upon its General Executive Board, and through it, of course, upon every Knight in the country. The Strike Committee was Gompers and Herman, of L. A. 2458, and Haller, suspended member of L. A. 2814. President Strasser of the International, also member of L. A. 2458, was the director of the committee and their acts, deny it as he may. This committee and ten Local Unions issued a number of boycotting and blackguarding circulars, directed against our Order. The official papers of the Union were crying out the boycott and slandering and denouncing the Knights of Labor and its General Executive Board. They were understood to express the sentiments of the officials of the Union, but Mr. Strasser and his Executive Board did nothing to discourage this conduct or to disown them; hence they were responsible. It is mere subterfuge to plead ignorance or want of authority. Mr. Kirchner, the Fourth Vice-President of the International and a member of the Executive Board, claiming at the same time to pass muster as a Knight of Labor, admitted that the Union was doing all in its power to put the white label of the Knights of Labor into disrepute.

"Do you," asked Brother Bailey, "object to members of the Knights of Labor asking for cigars or goods bearing the label of the Knights of Labor?"

"Yes; on cigars. The reason we object is that it works mischief and confusion."

All of which is extremely kind of the International Union, considering the

fact that the *first* cigar label was adopted by Knights, D. A. 3, of Pittsburg, before the International took up the question. Four years ago the General Assembly authorized the white label. The Union had its blue label nevertheless boomed by the Order, and it is yet whenever the Union reciprocates.

We only insist that in every shop, whichever organization is in control, clean cards should be recognized, whether they are held by International Unionists, Progressive Unionists, or Knights of Labor—an agreement, of course, being had as to prices.

That the principal efforts of this International Union Strike Committee were given to this boycotting business, and that their organization and its officials supported them, is further shown by the fact that their Executive Board endorsed the action of the Strike Committee, who sent out Haller, Gompers and Kirchner to the South, West and East to boom the blue label and denounce the Order, *paying their expenses from money collected for the strike fund*. [See Mirsky's testimony.] The boycotting was also carried on outside of New York, as, for example, in Newark. [See Wolf's statement.] And the white label generally was dubbed as the scab label all over the country. [See as to the latter *The Picket* of May 1st, quoting from the Springfield, Mo., *Justice*.]

Under all this abuse the General Executive Board of the Knights of Labor until now have remained silent, knowing that as soon as the facts in the case were made known to the Order the action of your Board would be justified.

The charges of scabism formulated against D. A. 49 are not sustained. But, on the contrary, the whole line of conduct pursued by the International Union and those in sympathy with it points to one irresistible conclusion—either International or nobody. No. 1. was the only party giving its leaders concern. All of which explains the sublime assurance evidenced by the proposition to our Order, made by Mr. Kirchner, on March 16th last. [See close of his testimony.] It was really a request to us to abdicate in favor of the Union. The International Union asked to be admitted into the Order in a body as a Local Assembly, *under its own Constitution*. The blue label was to be adopted as the one of our organization, and all Knights not in sympathy with the Internationals to be compelled to surrender their charter and go in under the wing of this Union. And, lastly—and here is the milk in the cocoa-nut—the officers of the new Local to be constituted from the present officials of the International.

We hardly think the million Knights of Labor, whose Order was founded by the sainted Stephens for the very purpose of counteracting the selfish sectarianism of trade unions, are yet prepared to step down and out in favor of a few organized cigar-makers, who do not even constitute the majority of their trade. They are not yet ready to disband, but shall long continue to follow out the design of the Order—to gather into one fold all branches of honorable toil.

Testimony taken before the General Executive Board, Knights of Labor.

ASTOR HOUSE, NEW YORK CITY, Tuesday, March 16, 1886.

Q. BROTHER BAILEY.—Are all members here in good standing?

A. All but Brother Davis, who was suspended by L. A. 2814, pending charges.

BROTHER GOMPERS, representing L. A. 2458, International Union, also non-union people still on strike.—We would, in behalf of those people, ask that both sides be present in order to cross-examine.

THE BOARD.—Inasmuch as the Board has not the time to devote to a very extended investigation, and being ordered to go to other sections of the country, we shall take each person's testimony and present the matter to the full Board when in session.

BROTHER DAVIS, of L. A. 2458, a witness called for the International Union, testified as follows:

Q. BROTHER GOMPERS.—State what is your connection with the Knights of Labor and International Union; what information you received from the President of the International Union as regards Levy Bros. and McCoy.

A. I am Secretary of the International Union and Master Workman of L. A. 2458; I received a circular for an application to strike against a reduction of wages in Levy Bros., Brown & Earle's and McCoy's, the application having been sustained by our Local Unions of the International.

Q. What action did L. A. 2458 take in reference to working in shops where the members were on strike?

No answer.

Q. **THE BOARD.**—All men of the Local Assembly were members of the International Union?

A. Yes.

Q. If the General Assembly sent you an order to resume work, would you do it?

A. That is a queer question to ask. As a member of the International Union I would obey it, and as a Knight of Labor I would obey also—I believe I would obey it.

Q. At the time of the strike, how many members were there in L. A. 2458?

A. I don't know; don't like to answer a question unless I have some knowledge of it.

Q. How long are you Master Workman?

A. Since December last, 1885.

Q. What time was the strike ordered?

A. About the middle of January.

Q. Is the strike still in progress?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Are there any strikers out of employment?

A. There are.

Q. Are you still paying strike benefits?

A. We are.

Q. How many are there still out and receiving benefits?

A. About two or three hundred.

As Master Workman, have you made application for labels?

A. Yes.

Q. How long ago?

A. First about two months ago for 10,000.

Q. Did you receive them?

A. No, sir.

Q. Have you made any more applications?

A. Yes; for 80,000.

Q. Have you received them?

A. No; I have seen Mr. Turner about it; he told me charges were pending against us, (L. A. 2458,) and all labels were stopped to New York City; and at the same time stated that by to-morrow we would receive them, or an answer why we would not receive them.

Q. Have you received them?

A. No.

Q. Have you sent the money for them?

A. Yes, sir; \$10 sent by mail, and \$50 I paid personally to Harry Taylor.

Q. Was the money accompanied by the proper order, with the seal of the Local attached?

A. Yes, sir.

PAUL HERMAN, a witness called for the International Union, testified as follows:

I am a member of the Knights of Labor since 1883, also a member of the International Union, and one of the strikers; was employed by Levy Brothers until the men went on strike. On January 2d went with other members of the Knights of Labor to the office of Levy Brothers and requested Mr. Oppenheimer for a copy of a price list of the Manufacturers' Association. Mr. Oppenheimer informed me that the Manufacturers' Association had a uniform price list, of which I could obtain a copy in the afternoon. Mr. Oppenheimer presented me with a price list ranging from \$7 to \$9.60 per thousand. The price list was a very heavy reduction in wages. January 4th, I went to work under the said price list with my colleagues, and on the same day members of the International Union in this shop resolved to make application to strike. Said application was sanctioned by the Committee of the International Union, the members of which were all Knights of Labor. We called at the office of Levy Brothers, January 14th or 15th, and protested against the reduction of wages, also demanded restoration of old prices. Mr. Oppenheimer replied that the case should be investigated by the Manufacturers' Association in case the strike was inaugurated. A previous meeting of the employees and the members of the International Union, also of members of Progressive Union, members of the Knights of Labor, and non-union people, resolved unanimously not to return, and to go on strike as soon as called to do so by Union Committee, and then not to return to work unless the old bill of wages was paid. The strike was ordered, and all employees, without any exception, came out. The Executive Committee of the Manufacturers' Association met on Friday morning, January 15th, at Levy Brothers' office, to investigate difficulties. The strikers were represented by the following members of the Knights of Labor: Samuel Gompers, Lewis Walder and Fred. Haller; the Progressives by L. Jablinowski and Bruckman. Case was investigated, and Mr. Oppenheimer stated to the Executive Committee that the reduction had taken place in his shop.

I was making re-rolled, mould No. 27, \$11 per thousand; price offered on the uniform price list, \$9.35 per thousand. On this cigar, I desire to add, the so-called compromise is \$9.45 to \$10 per thousand, a reduction of \$1 at present. Price paid on mould No. 31 before January, \$11; price offered, \$9.35; compromise price, \$10. Stop price paid previous to January, \$11; price offered, \$9.35; compromise price, \$10. Price paid previous on rainers, \$11.50; price offered, \$9.20; compromise price, \$9.65 to \$10.70. Pre-

vious there was only one system; now there are two, which is still a reduction on the present highest prices paid by the compromise on five-inch Londrex previous to January, \$12.50; price offered, \$10.10; compromise price, \$11.60. Dry mould work, long filler, mould 0, four and a quarter-inch, previous price paid, \$7.80; compromise price, \$7.70. Same in Havana, previous price, \$8.20; compromise price, \$8.10. Mould 27, scraps, previous price, \$7.85; compromise, \$7.35. Havana, \$8.40; compromise, \$8.10. Mould 29, long filler, previous price, \$7.80; compromise, \$7.70. Mould 30, long filler, previous price, \$8.50; compromise, \$8.15. Same in Havana, \$8.90; compromise, \$8.80. Mould 31, seed, previous price, \$8.20; compromise, \$7.70. Mould 32, cheroots, seed, previous price, \$5.60; compromise, \$5.55. Havana, \$5.90; compromise, \$5.25. Mould 35, seed, previous price, \$8.30; compromise, \$8.05. Havana, \$8.70; compromise, \$8.40. Mould 27, scraps, previous price, \$8.15; compromise, \$7.35. Mould 30, previous price, \$8.35; compromise, \$7.85. Mould 31, previous price, \$8.15; compromise, \$7.35. Mould 35, previous price, \$8.20; compromise, \$7.60. Mould 38, previous price, \$8.10; compromise, \$7.60. Mould 44, previous price, \$8.35; compromise, \$7.35. After the investigation, Mr. Oppenheimer stated that in his shops the average was 53 1-5 cents per thousand. The Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Manufacturers' Association put questions to the representatives of the strikers as to whether they would be willing to work under the new bill of prices until a more thorough investigation could be had. The Strike Committee offered for all of the cigar-makers to work under the old bill of prices pending the investigation. This offer was refused by the Manufacturers' Committee in the afternoon. L. Jablinski and myself were informed by Frank McCoy, President of the Manufacturers, that the lock-out would be ordered within three days. The lock-out was inaugurated. Promises were made to the strikers of Levy Brothers' shop by the committees of the International Union and Progressive Union that no conferences should be held with the Manufacturers' Association unless the Shop Committee was invited. Secret conferences were held with the Manufacturers' Association and a committee of the Central Labor Union and Progressive Union at the Grand Union Hotel, and a compromise was effected.

This was referred to the vote of the members of the Progressive Union only. Members of the Knights of Labor, International Union and non-union people were not allowed to vote on this compromise. This compromise was rejected by the members of the Progressive Union, and one week later a new compromise was effected by the same committee. This was only referred to the members of the Progressive Union. Members of the Knights of Labor, International Union and non-union men were not allowed to vote. This new compromise price list means a lower price on many kinds of cigars, for which in the first compromise higher prices were offered; but the lower compromise was accepted by the Progressive and Central Labor Union after the higher compromise was rejected. One week previous the second compromise tenement-house work was recognized by the committee of the Progressive and Central Labor Union in fixing bill of prices for tenement-house cigars. [Gompers explains how the first compromise was accepted and the second rejected, although at the first a majority of the strikers was not allowed to vote on the compromise as they were not members of the Progressive Union.] The people employed in the tenement houses of other manufacturers not belonging to the Manufacturers' Association were allowed to vote on the question. For instance, the tenement-house cigar-makers of Joseph Rosenthals, Silverton and others. The strike or lock-out was declared at an end by the Manufacturers' Association without giving the strikers of Levy Brothers any notice. The shop was simply opened for whoever applied for work, and nearly all of the members of Progressive Union and most of the non-union people went to work in all the shops, although the shops of Levy Brothers, Brown & Earle, and Frank McCoy were declared strike shops by a majority of

their employees and by the Union, and although the Central Labor Union rejected the compromise and instructed their committee to demand the highest prices and the abolishment of the tenement-house system. I regard those men and women who went to work in the shops against a reduction as scabs; and I know that the scabs have been admitted into the Knights of Labor. I further know that the firm of Levy Brothers has been supplied with the Knights of Labor labels, and those labels for cigars made in their tenement houses and sold to the firm of Leggett & Co. I am still on strike, and still receiving strike benefits from the International Union, and I am unable to obtain employment in any shop controlled by the Manufacturers' Association for having taken an active part in this strike. I was boycotted. I lived at 215 Avenue C, boarding. The proprietor is a saloon-keeper, and he was informed by the scabs that they would not visit his saloon until the men who are on strike and are living in his house were out. I had to move.

Q. BROTHER GOMPERS.—Can you give us some information in reference to cigar packers during the lock-out?

A. I can. Before the lock-out was declared, Haller and myself visited Union No. 2. They resolved to order their members out on strike as soon as the lock-out was inaugurated. A mass meeting of packers was held in Concordance room. The resolution was adopted that the packers should not return to work until the old prices were restored to the Cigar-makers' Packers' Union No. 2; and the Executive of the striking packers resolved to declare the shops of Levy Brothers, Brown & Earle and McCoy strike shops. After the lock-out was declared at end to those packers, the International Union Strike Committee paid from \$700 to \$900 per week assistance. They were not members of the International Union. About one week after the lock-out, I was informed by F. Wanganham, a cigar packer, that he must go to work at Levy Brothers, as Mr. Rodgers had ordered him to do so. Several other striking packers informed me that Mr. Rodgers addressed a meeting of packers and made the statement that all strikers were ordered to go to work by order of the Knights of Labor. F. Wanganham went scabbing, and the rest followed a few days later. The packers also had been organized by Rodgers and Wolf into the Knights of Labor.

Q. BROTHER GOMPERS.—Before those packers went to work in McCoy's shops were you in possession of this document? [He here showed document.]

A. I was.

Q. Please translate it. [Document is German.]

A. I was acting as Strike Committee in Stohl & Fletcher's, Morrisania, and I represented the members of the International Union. Then the packers employed by that firm had no grievance, but they resolved to go out on strike to help the cigar-makers in their fight against reduction. Those packers were members of Progressive Union No. 13; and they explained to me that their strike application was afterwards also approved by their Union. While on strike this letter was handed by one of them, Mr. Pick, a member of the Order, February 14th, 1886, to striking packers of Stohl's shop at Morrisania: "You are hereby ordered to commence to work on Monday morning, February 15th, at McCoy's factory. We assure you that you will be employed steadily. Signed, Earnest Miller, Secretary." Seal of Progressive Union No. 13. Only one of them, Schwab, obeyed this order, and he has been initiated into the Order and is still working in McCoy's shop.

Q. BROTHER BAILEY.—Was the Striking Committee composed of International, Progressive, Knights of Labor and non-union men?

A. Yes.

Q. How many constituted this committee?

A. Allow me to explain: The Strike Committee of Progressive was invited by the committee of the International Union to act in conjunction during the lock-out. They, the

Progressive, appeared one evening and demanded from International Union Strike Committee that they must amend their Constitution before they could act with International Union. In this fight L. A. 2458 was represented on the Strike Committee. I am a member of L. A. 2458.

Q. Did your Local officially appoint their quota of this committee?

A. No; I don't know.

Q. Did the Knights of Labor and non-union men meet with you?

A. I don't know. Dampf said no members of the Knights of Labor were sent direct from the Assembly, but all members of that committee were members of the Assembly, and reported their doings to the Local Assembly.

Q. BROTHER BAILEY.—Are all cigar-makers who are Knights of Labor in L. A. 2458?

A. Don't know.

Q. BROTHER GOMPERS.—Was L. A. 2458 the first Local of cigar-makers?

A. At the time I joined, that was in 1883, I didn't hear of any other Local.

Q. BROTHER BAILEY.—Have you ever seen a circular sent out by any Cigar-makers' Union calling for members to boycott all cigars not bearing the International Union label?

A. I have.

Q. Have you ever seen circular calling for a boycott of all cigars bearing the white label of the Knights of Labor?

A. I did not.

Q. Have the Knights of Labor the right to fix a bill of prices for themselves?

A. In my opinion, the Cigar-makers' organization has that right; but I do not believe the Knights of Labor have a right to fix a bill of prices involving a reduction of former prices.

Q. If a body of Knights of Labor by majority vote to fix a bill of wages, have they not a right to fix it?

A. Majority has undoubtedly by its power the right to fix anything, but I don't always consider majorities just.

Q. BROTHER GOMPERS.—If 10,000 workmen belonging to a trade union went on strike against a reduction of wages, and a Local Assembly composed of about 25 members of that same trade, by a majority, say two-thirds of that 25, was to enter into a compromise involving a reduction of wages, would you consider that right?

A. I would not.

Q. And is it in this sense you made your answer to the question asked you by Brother Bailey?

A. It is in this sense undoubtedly.

[A discussion arose here with Mr. Kirchner, because giving the Master Workman answers.]

Q. BROTHER BAILEY.—Do you know it is contrary to the laws of the Knights of Labor to declare a strike without first trying to settle by arbitration?

A. Don't know. I believe if the Knights of Labor working in the shops did so they would be lynched by cigar-makers.

Q. BROTHER GOMPERS.—Was the strike at Levy Bros., where the trouble originated, gone into off-hand?

A. Strike was approved by International Union, Progressive and Central Labor Union, and by L. A. 2458.

Q. Was strike gone into off-hand?

A. No.

Q. Were the strikers not willing to submit their case to arbitration?

- A. If the old prices prevailed pending investigation.
- Q. And was that not proposed?
- A. They made such an offer to the Manufacturers' Association, but were refused.
- Q. BROTHER BAILEY.—Did the Knights of Labor, as Knights of Labor, demand arbitration?
- A. I did, as a Knight of Labor.
- Q. BROTHER HALLER.—Did D. A. 49 demand arbitration?
- A. They did not; not that I know of.
- Q. Did L. A. 2814 demand arbitration?
- A. I never heard of it.
- Q. Did L. A. 2458, or did any of these three shops, demand arbitration?
- A. They did not.
- Q. BROTHER BAILEY.—How many shops are now on strike?
- A. Three.
- Q. BROTHER KIRCHNER.—Did the two organizations, Progressive and International, *who had* jurisdiction, offer to arbitrate?
- A. The International Union did; Progressive did not.
- Q. BROTHER BAILEY.—How many members of the Knights of Labor are working in those three strike shops?
- A. I think there are about from 1,000 to 1,100.
- Q. BROTHER KIRCHNER.—How long have they been Knights of Labor?
- A. From one to three weeks.
- Q. BROTHER GOMPERS.—Were they proposed or initiated as members of the Knights of Labor before they went to work in a strike shop?
- A. They went to work first, and then they were proposed and initiated.
- Q. They did not enter as Knights of Labor?
- A. No; they entered as scabs.
- Q. BROTHER BAILEY.—Does the International Union declare all shops not under their control scab shops?
- A. No; those only where the prices are not paid. Such a shop is not a scab shop, unless working below the scale.
- Q. You said you knew the Knights of Labor label was given to manufacturers of tene-ment-house cigars?
- A. Yes; I said that, knowing that you would have the same chance to know if any other label was given, such as the International Union; I would know that.
- Q. Has any been given?
- A. None has been given.
- Q. Does the International Union take all branches of trade in their Union, such as strippers?
- A. Yes; from stripper to packer.
- Q. Can a booker or stripper be admitted into a Cigar-makers' Assembly?
- A. I regard such a person a cigar-maker.
- Q. Is it the custom in your city, where there is enough of any branch to form an Assembly of the Knights of Labor?
- A. It is customary.
- Q. BROTHER GOMPERS.—Are the branches all considered part of the cigar-makers?
- A. Certainly.
- Q. BROTHER BAILEY.—Have you heard any member or members of our Order say the Knights of Labor was going to open war on the International Union?

A. I know that Rodgers made a statement that the General Executive Board would suspend L. A. 2458.

Q. BROTHER GOMPERS.—Did you hear from members of the Order that they have opened war on the International Union and would destroy it, and L. A. 2458 with it?

A. I have.

Q. BROTHER BAILEY.—At what reduction are those three shops working?

A. I am positive the per cent. amounts from 32 to 99 cents per thousand on the average.

Q. What terms in your shop would remove the ban from those shops?

A. To remove the scab, adopt International scale of prices, and the reinstatement of the strikers.

Q. Would it be necessary, in connection with this, that all people become members of the International Union?

A. It would not.

Mr. DAVIS, a witness for the International Union, testified as follows:

I have been a member of L. A. 2814 since February 20th, 1884; I am one of the strikers, and have been a member of International No. 10 since December 19th, 1885; I was previously a member of Progressive Union No. 1; I am one of the strikers of McCoy's shop; came out with the rest against a reduction in wages. McCoy's prices on rolling, so far as I know, are: Mould work 38: previous price rolling, \$5.70; at present, \$5.10. Bunch-makers: previous, \$2.60; compromise, \$2.25. Long filler, No. 140: previous for rolling, \$5.95; compromise, \$5.20. Nos. 45, 14, 39 and 52: previous, \$5.45; compromise, \$5.10. Bunch-makers received: previous, \$2.60; compromise, \$2.25. No. 15: previous, \$5.70; compromise, \$5.30.

Q. BROTHER BAILEY.—You stated you came out with the balance of the strikers?

A. Yes.

Q. By whose order?

A. By order of the International Union.

[Brother Gompers called attention to the fact that he was locked out.]

We were locked out, and we did not return to work because we were locked out.

Q. BROTHER GOMPERS.—Did you leave the shop of McCoy before you were locked out together with the rest of the employees?

A. No.

Q. When the lock-out was declared at an end by the Manufacturers' Association, what resolution did the locked-out people of McCoy's shop pass?

A. They adopted a resolution not to work until the old rate of wages was restored.

Q. Did the International sustain the employees of McCoy's shop in the attempt to resist the reduction of wages?

A. Yes; Union and non-union.

Q. BROTHER BAILEY.—What is a lock-out?

A. Bosses locked their factories.

Q. This must be done when you are out?

A. We were locked out at the start. The employees of McCoy's passed a resolution not to go to work until we got the rate of wages. I left the shop with the rest after the lock-out was declared.

Q. You were then asked who ordered you out?

A. At the start we were locked out. When the lock-out was declared at an end by the bosses' Association, the employees of McCoy's resolved not to go back.

Q. THE BOARD.—Do you mean that you are one of the strikers?

A. I do.

- Q. You did not become a striker until the shop was declared open?
- A. Yes.
- Q. You say that you joined with the strikers. Did your Assembly order you to strike?
- A. No.
- Q. BROTHER GOMPERS.—Did your Assembly order you?
- A. In fact, I couldn't say. No.
- Q. Why couldn't you?
- A. Because I was deprived of being present at sessions of L. A. 2814.
- Q. Were you deprived admission to your Assembly previous to, or after the close of the lock-out?
- A. After the close of the lock-out.
- Q. THE BOARD.—Is your Local Assembly composed of cigar-makers?
- A. No.
- Q. BROTHER GOMPERS.—What other branch?
- A. Bunch-makers.
- Q. THE BOARD.—You were deprived of being present at the session?
- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Do you know whether your Assembly ordered its members back or not?
- A. I don't know.
- Q. Do you know whether the members of your Local Assembly did return to work?
- A. Yes; one member.
- Q. Did you hear that your Assembly had ordered its people back?
- A. No.
- Q. BROTHER GOMPERS.—What was the membership of your Local about the time of the cigar-makers' lock-out?
- A. About sixty.
- Q. How many of that sixty were working in McCoy's shop when the lock-out took place?
- A. I was the only one.
- Q. Did your Local demand arbitration?
- A. I don't know.
- Q. If it had demanded arbitration, would you have known it?
- A. Yes.
- MISS EVA DOERR, a witness called for the International Union, testified as follows:
I work at Brown & Earle's, at rolling.
- Q. Were you locked out?
- A. No.
- Q. Did you go on strike at Brown & Earle's?
- A. Yes.
- Q. For what?
- A. To resist a reduction.
- Q. On the work that you were making, what is the reduction?
- A. Sixty cents a thousand for rolling.
- Q. Are you working now?
- A. No, sir.
- Q. What Assembly do you belong to?
- A. L. A. 2453.
- Q. Did this Assembly order you to resist this reduction?
- A. Progressive No. 1 ordered me to strike.
- Q. Are you a member of Progressive No. 1?

A. No. I was, but not at the time I was ordered out.

Q. How long have you been a member of L. A. 2458?

A. Since March 10th.

Q. Did you belong to any Union at the time of the strike?

A. Yes; International.

Q. BROTHER GOMPERS.—Did not the Central Labor Union Committee, as well as the Progressive Committee, come to your shop to order you to strike?

A. Yes.

Q. Did or did not the committee from the Central Labor Union at the same time come to your shop and order you to strike?

A. They did.

Q. Did or did not the committee of the International Union request you not to go on strike at that time?

A. They told us to wait until we were locked out. The employees of Brown & Earle did not want to get locked out, but in this instance struck against the reduction.

Q. THE BOARD.—You stated that you were ordered out by Progressive No. 13?

A. Yes.

Q. You also stated you were not ordered out?

A. I did not say so.

MISS LIZZIE BUIHL, a witness called for the International Union, testified as follows:

Was employed at Levy Bros.' before the strike; am a bunch-maker; the reduction on bunches was 75 cents per 1,000.

Q. How much would it amount to?

A. A difference per week of about \$3.

Q. THE BOARD.—You are a member of L. A. 2458 since March 10th. Did you belong to the International?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. At the time the strike was declared?

A. I did.

Q. Who ordered you on strike?

A. The International.

Q. You are still out?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What did it cost you to join the Assembly?

A. The International Union paid it.

Q. Do you know how many more of the ladies who were members of the International had their fees paid for them?

A. All those who were on strike had their fees paid for them until they got to work again.

Q. Who said that?

A. Mr. Dohne.

Q. Did you wish to join the Order?

A. I did.

Q. Had you ever been solicited to join before March 10th?

A. No, sir.

Q. Did you know that you were going to join the Order, and, if so, how long before the 10th of March?

A. About three or four days.

Q. That those desiring to join could?

A. Yes ; it was said in shop meeting.

Q. Did you ever see a Constitution of the Knights of Labor ?

A. No, sir.

Q. Who told you that it was necessary for you to join the Knights of Labor ?

A. No one told me ; I did it for my own benefit.

Q. Would you state how many girls joined the same night ?

A. There were over fifty.

Q. So they must all have had the same thing in their minds together ?

A. I suppose so.

Q. BROTHER GOMPERS.—When you were initiated did you or did you not find quite a number of bunch-makers from Levy Bros.' in the Order ?

A. I did.

Q. Do you know that Lichtenstein Bros. & Co. paid the fee of the strippers in the Local Assembly ?

A. I don't know.

Q. You have been out two months, do you think you were right ?

A. I do.

MISS TILLIE SPURNA, a witness called for the International Union, testified as follows :

I am working for Brown & Earle at bunch-making.

Q. How long have you been a member of L. A. 2458 ?

A. Since March 10th.

Q. What Union did you belong to before the 10th of March ?

A. The International.

Q. How long previous to the 10th of March were you aware of the fact that you were going into the Knights of Labor ?

A. About three weeks.

Q. Who informed you ?

A. I don't know.

Q. Did anybody tell you ?

A. No.

Q. How much did it cost you to join the Knights of Labor ?

A. \$1.

Q. Who paid it ?

A. I did.

Q. Did you see the Constitution of the Knights of Labor ?

A. No.

Q. Did you ever see a proposition blank of the Knights of Labor ?

A. No.

J. GUMPRINCHT, a witness called in behalf of the International Union, testified as follows :

Worked in Brown & Earle's, at rolling ; am a member of the Order, L. A. 2458, since December, 1884 ; also a member of the International for seven years.

Q. What was the reduction of wages ?

A. About 65 cents per 1,000.

Q. What difference ?

A. About \$1.60 per week ; I am a slow hand.

Q. BROTHER GOMPERS.—Did you go on a strike from Brown & Earle's ?

A. Yes, against my will ; was forced out by members of Progressive ; also, the Central Labor Union.

Q. Explain what you mean by being forced out against your will ?

- A. As a Union member I had to await the action of my Union and see what they did.
- Q. Were you in favor of accepting the reduction?
- A. No.
- Q. Did you rather prefer the plea that the employees should be locked out than have a general strike?
- A. Yes.
- Q. BROTHER HALLER.—What do you call forced out? Did the shop adopt any resolutions?
- A. No.
- Q. The shop did not?
- A. At the first meeting prior to the strike, we passed a resolution not to go back until we got the wages.
- Q. BROTHER GOMPERS.—In that compromise effected, accepting reduction of wages by the committee of Central Labor Union, was it ratified by Central Labor Union?
- A. It was rejected by Central Labor Union.
- Q. Is it customary for you to obey the order of any other Union in preference to your own?
- A. No; but in this instance I did; yes.
- Q. Why did you disobey your own Union for another?
- A. Because a strong committee of the Central Labor Union and Progressive influenced all the non-union people to stay out. They had them out and they pulled them out, because of the reduction. Our shop is one of the strongest in the city.
- Q. Do you say you came out before the Central Labor Union Committee compelled you to stay out?
- A. No; they called a meeting. We were out.
- Q. How many Knights of Labor were there in that shop?
- A. Not over ten; all belonged to L. A. 2458.
- Q. You were ordered to remain at work by International Union for five days, you were forced out against your will, you never appealed to Knights of Labor or International; if the Knights of Labor had ordered you to return to work, would you have done so?
- A. I won't answer it.
- Q. If the Knights of Labor had ordered you back to work while the case was being investigated, would you have gone?
- A. Yes, I would.
- Q. After the non-union people were influenced to close, did or did not the International Committee say that, as it seems impossible to keep the people back from striking, you might as well go with them?
- A. Yes.
- Q. How many Knights of Labor are working at Brown & Earle's now?
- A. They are all Knights of Labor.
- Q. Were they members of the Knights of Labor when they took the job in that shop?
- A. No.
- Q. Did they go to work while the striking employees of that shop were still out?
- A. Yes.
- Q. THE BOARD.—How do you know they were made Knights of Labor when they went to work in that shop?
- A. They told me so.
- Q. How do you know they were made Knights of Labor before they went in that shop?
- A. One day the strikers of the shop held a large meeting. There were over three-fourths

out that day. They called around to our regular meeting place, Thirty-eight street, and told all the non-union people to leave our meeting place and go over to Forty-first street to the meeting place. I went along with them as a striker. As I came in front of the saloon, they asked me what I was doing there. I answered: "I am a striker, and got a right to go into this meeting as well as any other of the shop." When I came as far as the door they said: "You can't come in; this is going to be a meeting to take all the strikers in the Knights of Labor." I said: "If it is a Knights of Labor, I have a right to go in anyhow." But they would not let me in without I would go back to work for them. They would then let me in. This I refused. As they came out, those we had on the strike list, that we had taken out the day before, told us: "We don't care now if you call us all the scabs you want; we will be Knights of Labor now."

Q. BROTHER HALLER.—Were they all working?

A. No. After January 1st, as I came back, foreman showed me price list, which for cigar called T was \$5, rolling up, which is now \$4.80 and \$4.90.

Q. Have you ever heard any one say that the International Union was going to declare war on goods with the K. of L. label on?

A. No.

Q. Have you ever seen a circular sent out by the International Union calling for Unions and Knights of Labor to boycott all cigars that had no International label on?

A. Yes.

WEDNESDAY MORNING, March 17, 1886.

HENRY PEBLER, a witness called on part of the International Union, testified as follows: I was working at Brown & Earle's shop, rolling; am a member of the Order, L. A. 2458, since the 10th of March, and of the International Union since 1881. The reduction on New York work is 55 cents per 1,000, or about \$1.40 per week.

Q. BROTHER BAILEY.—Was Brown & Earle's an International Union shop?

A. No, sir. Was not an International shop, but was composed of Progressive, International and non-union men.

Q. Please state which faction was the strongest in the shop.

A. Of the Unions, the Progressive and International were about equal, embracing about two-thirds of all.

Q. So the non-unions were about equal to either of the other two?

A. Yes.

Q. Did you strike or were you ordered out?

A. Forced out by the Progressive and Central Labor Unions—a committee from each.

Q. Do you know the names of the committee?

A. I can name some of them—Progressive Union: Brueckmann and Fuhse; Central Labor Union: Sanders and Emerich. About three to five more that I don't know the names of.

Q. Did the Progressives settle this strike before the Knights of Labor took hold of them?

A. Yes, sir; to the best of my knowledge.

Q. Did you make application to the Knights of Labor of your own accord?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you read the Constitution of the Knights of Labor?

A. No, sir.

Q. Did you fill out and read the proposition blank?

A. No, sir.

Q. Did you pay your initiation fee?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you heard it said by any person that the International Union was going to declare war upon the Knights of Labor or goods bearing their seal?

A. No, sir. Just the opposite.

Q. Have you seen a circular sent out by the President of the International, or any of its officials, asking all Unions and Knights of Labor to boycott all cigars that did not have the International label on them?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did L. A. 2458 indorse the circular?

A. Don't know.

Q. BROTHER GOMPERS.—Did the members of the International Union working at Brown & Earle's hold their regular shop meeting before the trouble occurred?

A. Yes, sir; every Saturday.

Q. When the employees of Brown & Earle went on strike against the reduction of wages, did they or did they not act as a unit in declaring a strike?

A. Yes; all acted together—International Union, Progressive and non-union.

Q. Did or did they not resolve to return to work except in a body, and then only at the old rate of wages?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. During the strike and until the reduction of wages had been accepted, didn't you hold your shop meeting jointly?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. In the circular calling upon all to boycott all cigars not bearing the International Union label, is the name or seal of the International Union or its President on it?

A. No; I believe it is the Strike Committee of the International Union of New York.

Q. BROTHER BAILEY.—Was the reduction accepted by the Progressive and non-union men?

A. No, sir; only by the Progressive Union. Non-union people went in that shop and made it a Knights of Labor shop.

Q. How long after the acceptance of the reduction by the Progressive Union did the non-union people remain out?

A. Some of them did not return until last Thursday.

Q. Did the International continue to hold joint meetings with the non-union people after the acceptance of the reduction by the Progressive?

A. Yes, sir; they declared they would not return to work without receiving the old wages. They were frightened by the Progressive stating that the Knights of Labor had declared the strike at an end.

BROTHER FRED. HALLER, called for the International Union, testified as follows:

I am a member of the Knights of Labor since September, 1883, at present a member of L. A. 2814, (that is where I am booked as a member,) and also a member of the International. I was on the Strike Committee of the International Union of this city in this difficulty. The Union had resolved to resist the reduction of wages in the shops of the Manufacturers' Association. It was deemed advisable to take but one shop at a time. The shop of Levy Bros. was the one selected. We had great difficulty in preventing the cigar-makers in the fourteen shops of the Association from going on a general strike. After the strike in Levy's shop had been in progress three or four days, the manufacturers of the Association closed their shops, locking the people out; that is, they gave three days' notice to their employees that, if Levy Bros. were not supplied with a full number of hands, they would

lock out at the expiration of the three days. After the lock-out was in force eight or nine days we had a suspicion that the Progressive Committee were clandestinely dealing with the Manufacturers' Association. Our suspicions being aroused by an advertisement in the New York *Volks-Zeitung*, calling for a special meeting at the unusual hour of 10, A. M., on a work day, we placed two pickets at the entrance of the Grand Union Hotel, the headquarters of the Manufacturers' Association. The pickets asked the clerk if there was any session of the Manufacturers' Association that day, or of its committee. They were answered in the negative. But the pickets ascertained through the bar-keeper that there was a session, and that a committee was present at the session, in Parlor A. A man was sent up to Parlor A to seek admission, and was met at the door by Mr. Sanders, of the Central Labor Union Committee, and informed that the committee of the Progressive was in session. When the pickets reported to the Strike Committee, a resolution denouncing the action of the Progressive Committee was immediately adopted and given to the press. It so happened that the result of the conference was submitted to the members of the Progressive Union in their various branches on the same day that our resolutions appeared in the press. The effect was that the members of the Progressive Union rejected the compromise. The committee of the Progressive Union then immediately began to confer with the Manufacturers' Association again, and they adopted a resolution that the International Committee should not be represented at that conference. A second compromise was agreed upon there in which the tenement-house system of manufacturing cigars was recognized and given sanction by the Progressive Committee. This compromise was ratified by the Progressive Union in a general meeting in which the tenement-house workers of other tenement-house cigar factories constituted the bulk of those present. When this became known, the striking employees of the three shops, in their meeting, discussed the question. Resolutions were introduced in these joint shop meetings disapproving of this act, and when the vote was to be taken on those resolutions a number of the Progressives would leave the shop. This happened in all three shops a number of times. Some of the Progressive members who disapproved of this compromise remained in the hall with the other strikers. When the manufacturers opened their shops, those members of the Progressive Union left the hall where a vote was about to be taken when the resolutions were mentioned and returned to work. At the time they were not members of the Knights of Labor. The members of the International and non-union people and the Knights of Labor remained on strike; so did the packers who had gone out in support of the cigar-makers. In the mean time the packers had organized in the Knights of Labor. They were deceived by members of D. A. 49. Over a week after the Progressive had returned to work the packers were told by officers of D. A. 49 that the firm involved had agreed to pay the International scale of prices. Thereupon the packers returned to work. When they were at work some two days they suspected they were being deceived, and insisted on seeing the agreement that the manufacturers would pay the International scale. They then found out that the compromise of the Progressive Union was in force, and that the manufacturers had made no change from that compromise. Some of the packers tried to have their colleagues come out of the shop again, but were prevented from doing so by officers of D. A. 49. I am informed that during this difficulty the committee of the Cigar-makers' International Union, of which I was a member, called on Mr. F. B. Thurber, at his request, for the purpose of trying to find a way of settling the difficulty at McCoy's shop. There we were met by Mr. Daily, of the Board of Arbitration of D. A. 49, and also Mr. Rodgers, I believe, of that Board. The result of that compromise is as follows:

Memorandum of points formulated February 24th, at a conference of gentlemen interested in the settlement of the questions pending between the cigar manufacturers and the cigar-makers:

1. That so far as McCoy's factory is concerned a scale of prices is to be established not lower than the scale now in force in the factory of Kerbs & Spiess.

2. That said factory is to be exclusively a Knights of Labor shop.

3. That there is no objection on the part of the Internationals to their men becoming Knights of Labor, nor on the part of the Knights of Labor to their men becoming Union men.

4. That the old employees who struck against the manufacturers' scale be reinstated in said factory.

A copy of these was furnished to each of the parties present, with the agreement that an answer be given the next day. The following day our committee called at the office of Mr. Thurber, where they met Messrs. McCoy, T. B. McGuire, Daily and Rodgers, of D. A. 49. The committee of the International Union stated that it had agreed to the proposition. Messrs. McCoy, T. B. McGuire, Daily and Rodgers objected to it, so the conference was then broken off. At the first one of these conferences Mr. Daily said that they had already legislated the International Union out of existence; he also said that these manufacturers of the Association could not be expected to pay International scale of prices, bringing in the plea of competition, notwithstanding the fact that those prices (International prices) are being paid by a number of large and small manufacturers of this city. There the matter rests.

Q. BROTHER GOMPERS.—What was the spirit with which the committee of the International Union was received by the committee of D. A. 49 at Thurber's office?

A. It was a spirit of decided hostility. As an illustration of that spirit I would cite as an instance that T. B. McGuire attempted to use his prerogatives as District Master Workman to prohibit a man by the name of Shields, a Delegate to D. A. 49, I believe, from taking part in the conference, because Shields was not favorable to the action taken by the representatives of D. A. 49, and denied their right to do so. Mr. Thurber intervened by saying that he had invited Mr. Shields to be there, and intimating it was his house, and no one had the right to put him out.

Q. Did or did not T. B. McGuire object to the employment of the strikers?

A. He did.

Q. Was he or was he not told that several of the strikers were members of the Order?

A. He was told that a number of them were.

Q. When some of the workmen had accepted the reduction in wages and returned to work, and before the committee of the Knights of Labor of D. A. 49 interfered, what were the situation and chances for success of the strike?

A. In my opinion they were very favorable. I don't believe that any strike of workmen of such dimensions ever looked so favorable as that one did at the time.

Q. BROTHER BAILEY.—Who were the committee that went up to the hotel?

A. They were Progressive and Central Labor Union.

Q. How did you know all about those resolutions?

A. We didn't know what was done there; we only knew they were in secret conference; that we (International) were not represented, nor were the non-union people represented there.

Q. You stated that Brother McGuire objected to the employment of the strikers, and you said that he was told that a number of them were Knights of Labor?

A. Yes.

Q. How long had T. B. McGuire known, before this conference, they were Knights of Labor?

A. I don't know how long before; but this I do know, that one of the strikers of McCoy's shop was a Delegate to D. A. 49. His name is Bernard Davis.

Q. How long before this were they members?

A. I don't know.

Q. Have you heard any one say that the International Union was going to declare war on the goods bearing the K. of L. label?

A. No.

Q. Not anything in reference to it?

A. I know this, that the feeling was to declare war against the goods of Levy Brothers, McCoy and Brown & Earle.

Q. Regardless of what label was on them?

A. That was the feeling of some members.

Q. Do you know of or have you seen a circular sent out by Mr. Strasser calling on all Unions and Knights of Labor to boycott all cigars that did not bear the International label?

A. Have not seen or heard; that is, from the International President.

Q. Have you seen any circular sent out calling for the same; if so, state whether it was by the authority of the officials of the International Union?

A. I have; but the officials of the International had nothing to do with it, and if they had I would have known it.

Q. And those circulars were not by authority, not of the officers of the International Union?

A. No; they were not.

Q. Have you ever heard any person say that the Knights of Labor were going to declare war on the International Union?

A. Yes; not exactly in those terms. The terms in which I heard that assertion were: "We, the Knights of Labor, are going to wipe out the Cigar-makers' International Union."

Q. Did those who you said you heard make that statement have the authority to make it?

A. I don't know if they had the authority to do so; but one who I heard say that was an officer in D. A. 49.

Q. Who has the authority to make such a declaration for our Order?

A. The General Executive Board and the General Assembly.

Q. Have you heard any such declaration made by this Board?

A. I have not.

Q. BROTHER GOMPERS.—Did or did you not hear such a statement made by a member of the General Executive Board?

A. I did not hear it.

Q. [Shown Doc. 1.] Is that the International seal?

A. Yes; it is.

Q. Those circulars sent out by Strike Committee, were they signed by the Strike Committee?

A. Signed "The Strike Committee."

Q. [Shown Doc. 2.] Is this one sent out by the Strike Committee?

A. Yes; it bears no signature of this committee.

Q. [Shown Doc. 3.] Was this sent out by your committee?

A. Yes.

Q. No signature of Strike Committee?

A. The general Strike Committee signed for the Local Unions involved in this strike in this city.

Q. Do you wish to say anything in connection with those circulars?

A. No; they can speak for themselves.

Q. Were the officers of the Cigar-makers' International Union ever advised or their consent given before the three different circulars shown you were issued, and do you know that the International Executive Board was never consulted?

No answer.

Q. Do you know the names of the Executive Board?

A. Yes; I can't repeat them.

Q. Is any member of the Board present?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you know whether the Executive Board of the International Union have taken any steps to prevent or recall them?

A. I don't know that the Executive Board is at all aware of the existence of those circulars.

Q. Their printing and circulation?

A. No.

Q. BROTHER BAILEY.—Do you mean all that?

A. I do.

Q. Are you a member of the International Union Executive Board?

A. No; I hold no office.

Q. How do you know they did not receive the sanction of the Executive Board?

A. Because I am a member of the Strike Committee who issued the circulars; attended every meeting.

FRANK GUNTNER, a witness called for the International Union, testified as follows:

I work in Brown & Earle's at rolling, and joined the International Union five years ago, and the Knights of Labor in February, 1883. The reduction of 50 cents per 1,000 with the compromise makes a difference of about \$1.40 per week.

Q. BROTHER BAILEY.—Have you remained in good standing in L. A. 2458 since 1883?

A. Yes.

Q. You are now on strike?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. By whose order?

A. The International Union ordered me out, and I understood I was to receive the protection of the Order.

Q. Did the Progressive Union make this compromise?

A. They, with the Central Labor Union Committee.

Q. BROTHER GOMPERS.—Did the Central Labor Union repudiate the compromise?

A. It did.

Q. When the Progressive accepted the compromise, what was the position of the strike?

A. Very good. We held these three shops—Levy Bros., Brown & Earle, and McCoy.

Q. When the Progressive accepted that compromise, what was the action of the packers?

A. They condemned the action of the Progressive Union, and resolved not to return to work until all aggrieved should be reinstated (return to work) and the old prices should be restored previous to January 2d.

Q. When the packers resolved to remain out on strike, was that favorable to the Striking Committee's position?

A. Most decidedly. Even if they had enough scab cigar-makers the goods could not have been sold without being packed.

Q. BROTHER HALLER.—What did the Progressive Union do after the packers passed that resolution in reference to the cigar-makers' packers, after the packers refused to return to work?

A. They sent a committee to the packers, and threatened if they did not return to work they would do all in their power to fill their places.

Q. Did they try to fill their places?

A. They did; they even went so far as to put unskilled men in their places.

Q. Did they succeed in getting enough packers to fill their places?

A. They did not until D. A. 49 interfered.

Q. How did D. A. 49 interfere?

A. They promised the firm that they would give them the white label, providing they made Knights of Labor shops, and then ordered the packers to go to work.

Q. At the time the packers were ordered back to work, were the cigar-makers working in the shops already initiated or not in the Order?

A. They were not.

Q. Do you know whether they were taken in after that?

A. I do.

Q. BROTHER BAILEY.—What Union did the packers belong to?

A. Packer's Union No. 2.

Q. You say we held these three shops. Who do you mean by we?

A. The strikers.

Q. Were those three shops under the control of the International Union?

A. The International only controlled its own members, and the non-union men, through principle and to fight the reduction, made common cause with the International.

Q. You stated here everything looked favorable until D. A. 49 interfered?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. How do you know D. A. 49 interfered?

A. Was told by the packers of Packers' Union No. 2.

Q. How do you know that D. A. 49 made promises to manufacturers to give them the label?

A. Because the manufacturers made each of its employees join the Knights of Labor, telling them that they had to get the white label.

Q. Are you one of those packers?

A. No, sir.

Q. How do you know the manufacturers made the people join the Knights of Labor?

A. The strikers who succeeded in getting employment in the factories of the combined manufacturers were told that they would have to join the Progressive Club, which is a Local Assembly attached to D. A. 49.

Q. BROTHER GOMPERS.—Those packers belonging to Packers' Union No. 2, did they say they were going to be members of the Order?

A. They told me that all persons employed in the three factories had to join the Knights of Labor of D. A. 49.

Q. BROTHER BAILEY.—When those packers told you that all persons working in those three shops had to join the Knights of Labor, did they not say *before* said manufacturers could receive the Knights of Labor labels?

A. No, sir.

Q. Did they say anything about labels?

A. The manufacturers told them they had to have the white label and had to have Knights of Labor shops.

Q. BROTHER GOMPERS.—Did they or did they not speak of the Knights of Labor label to oppose the International Union label?

A. I have not heard from packers.

Q. Have you heard it at all?

A. I did.

Q. From whom?

A. From cigar-makers scabbing in those three factories.

BROTHER SAMUEL GOMPERS, a witness called for the International Union, testified as follows:

I have been a member of L. A. 2458 since its institution, a member of the Cigar-makers' International Union since its institution, (except an interruption of about six months,) and also a member of the general Strike Committee of the Unions of the city of New York. As a member of that committee I have had considerable to do with the management of the strike, and know that in the shops of Levy Bros., Brown & Earle and McCoy large reductions of wages have taken place. I was present at many of the shop meetings, both during the strike and lock-out, and heard the resolutions testified to by the witnesses discussed and voted upon. When the Progressive resolved to accept the reduction of wages the packers still refused to return to work unless the old wages were restored and strikers re-employed. The situation was very peculiar, inasmuch as they had made a contract with the employers and were unable to fulfil it. The strike at that time was in a position looking towards success. I am personally aware of the fact that a committee of D. A. 49 interfered. Whether in this they had authority of D. A. 49 or not I don't know, except that I have the word of the committee that they had authority. On arriving at the headquarters of the general Strike Committee one morning, I was informed that the packers of Levy Bros.' shops were about to return to work, and was told to go to their meeting place and ascertain the truth or falsity of that rumor. I went there and found the packers in session. I inquired and learned that the committee of D. A. 49 had been there and told the packers that the influence of the entire Order would be brought to bear and fill up the places of the cigar packers of the three striking shops, and that this was their only chance to become initiated into the Order and return to work. I know that Mr. Rodgers, of D. A. 49, in a meeting of cigar packers, denounced the International Union, and told the packers that the International Union was not and would not be considered by the Knights of Labor; that, if those packers decided to join the International Union, they could not become members of the Order of Knights of Labor; that the Cigar-makers' Local of the Order (L. A. 2458) was not recognized.

Q. BROTHER BAILEY.—Have you heard any one say that the International Union was going to declare war on cigars bearing the Knights of Labor label?

A. No, sir.

Q. Have you heard that Mr. Strasser had sent out a circular asking all Unions and Assemblies of the Knights of Labor to boycott all cigars except those that had the International blue label on the box?

A. He never issued such a circular. If he had I would have known it.

Q. Has Mr. Strasser, in his capacity as President of your Association, the right to issue a circular of the description I stated?

A. I don't know.

Q. BROTHER HALLER.—Have you ever heard any one say that the Knights of Labor were going to wipe out the Cigar-makers' International Union or declare war against them?

A. Yes, several; some in very high authority in the Order, and who would be presumed to speak in an official way.

Q. Who was it?

A. General Secretary-Treasurer Frederick Turner, District Master Workman T. B. McGuire, of D. A. 49, Chairman of Committee on Arbitration and Strikes, and Brother Daily, of D. A. 49. Brother Turner made that remark on several occasions; once in the presence of General Master Workman Powderly and Brother Hayes.

Q. BROTHER BAILEY.—Don't you know that no one or two members of the Board could declare war against any trade union in the name or by authority of the Knights of Labor?

A. I know that. But I also know that statements coming from so high an official, and about the making of which there is no secrecy, convey weight and influence. I wish to say I am not desirous of taking up the time of the committee. For the sake of brevity, I indorse the testimony of Brother Fred. Haller in every particular.

BROTHER JOHN D. KIRCHNER, a witness called for the International Union, testified as follows:

I became a member of the Order during the great railroad strike of 1877; have not been connected with any other organization except the Order until 1880, when I became a charter member of International Union No. 10, and have been a member of that organization ever since, while at the same time continuing membership in L. A. 53 of the Knights of Labor, and am now an Executive Officer of Cigar-makers' Union. I have been directed by my superiors in authority to read the following protest, [Document 4:]

BUFFALO, N. Y., March 6, 1886.

T. V. POWDERLY, ESQ., *G. M. W. of the K. of L.*

DEAR SIR:—The recent action of your Organizers, and of D. A. 49 of the Knights of Labor, of New York City, in interfering with the management of our strike, compels me to submit my protest against the action of such persons. The Cigar-makers' International Union has, by an almost unanimous vote, approved a strike against a reduction of wages in several shops, which is still in progress. From personal investigation and information received, the fact appears that the scabs in the shops of Levy Bros., Frank McCoy and Brown & Earle have been organized as members of the Knights of Labor. The employers of these scabs have also been promised the white label of the Knights of Labor on the production in their factories, evidently as a reward for employing scab labor and paying low wages. I consider the action of your Organizers in New York City, and of D. A. 49 of the Knights of Labor, a bold and unscrupulous attack upon recognized trade-union principles, and as hostile to the Cigar-makers' International Union in particular.

At the same time I call your attention to a letter which you have mailed on December 28th, 1885, to William H. Foster, Secretary of the Federation of Trades. In that letter you disapprove of such crimes as have been committed against the Cigar-makers' International Union in New York City.

Should you fail to denounce the action of your Organizers, &c., in New York City, you will merit the condemnation of the Cigar-makers' International Union, and of every National Trade Union in the country.

The President and Secretary of the Manufacturers' Association admitted in my presence to you that they would be compelled to surrender in case you would refuse to help them out of the trap in which they had caught themselves.

I now demand action on your part. Should you fail to listen to the warning contained in my letter, the Cigar-makers' International Union will be compelled to protect itself against unscrupulous employers and so-called labor reformers.

Yours, respectfully,

A. STRASSER, *International Union.*

In following up that protest, the Cigar-makers' International Union and its Executive Officers hold that, in matters affecting the cigar industry, its jurisdiction is second to no other organization; that if it is not supreme it is at least coequal, and will not permit the settlement of a strike inaugurated by it unless such settlement has been concurred in by the

International Union; and, in matters of strikes, demands the obedience of its members to the strike provision contained in its Constitution. [Here presents Constitution, Doc. 5.]

I, as well as all other members, have always regarded that a cigar-maker was deficient in duty if he was not connected with the International Union. The Executive Officers do not look upon L. A. 2458 as an authority to the strikes approved by the International Union, and now going on in McCoy's, Brown & Earle's and Levy Bros.' Neither do we regard as such L. A. 2814 or D. A. 49, those organizations not having inaugurated those strikes. I further regard the action of L. A. 2458 as rendering some little assistance to an honorable branch of toil. Even the very existence of the International Union is threatened by the persistent and continuous demands made by the Knights of Labor for cigars with the white label of the Knights of Labor, and also the blue seal adopted by L. A. 53, Knights of Labor, one manufacturer in the city of Philadelphia having over one year ago ordered one of the members of the International to either join the Order or to quit his employ. I know, further, that the firm of T. G. Dunn & Co., of Philadelphia, notified four of the International members in their employ to either join the Knights of Labor or quit the shop. Some of the members in that shop informed me that he would deduct their initiation fee from their weekly wages. I have been informed by Albert Gumpert that his agent reported to him that the Knights of Labor of the Southwest exclusively demand the white label. As an Executive Officer of the International Union, it has come to my knowledge in various ways that there is (although it may not be open or officially so) an hostility to the further spreading of the International Union. It is my desire as an Executive Officer to avoid, if possible, any open warring of the two forces, and to this end I will submit the following proposition, and urge on all whom I may have any influence with its adoption:

ASTOR HOUSE, BROADWAY AND VESEY ST. }
NEW YORK, March 16, 1886. }

To the General Master Workman and Members of the General Executive Board of the Knights of Labor:

The undersigned respectfully submits the following points as a basis for settling the difficulties between the Knights of Labor and the Cigar-makers' International Union of America:

1st. Whereas the hands in the employ of McCoy & Co., Levy Bros. and Brown & Earle are out on strike against a reduction of wages with the almost unanimous approval of the organized cigar-makers of the country; and whereas such strike has been defeated by the interference on the part of certain members of D. A. 49 by organizing the scabs in the Knights of Labor, and furnishing the scab bosses with the Knights of Labor label, in the face of our indignant and just protest;

Therefore, we demand that the General Executive Board denounce the action of D. A. 49 as against organized trade-union principles.

2d. That inasmuch as the above-mentioned strike was the result of the action taken by the Cigar-makers' International Union of America, no honorable settlement of the same can be ordered unless concurred in by that organization; and to this end the Executive Board of the Knights of Labor, in justice to itself as well as to the rightful demands of labor, annuls the membership of the scabs employed by the above-named firms, by pronouncing their admission into the Order as a gross violation of the principles of the Knights of Labor, and that the Locals attached to D. A. 49, as well as D. A. 49, be prevented from issuing any more labels for their product.

We demand the above action because we hold that the Knights of Labor had no right or authority to interfere in the strike, inasmuch as the Cigar-makers' International Union of America was the only proper authority, by virtue of the strike having been the result of its action only. Should the above be the result of your deliberation, we would most sincerely submit the following counter proposal:

1st. That a joint conference be arranged between the General Executive Board of the Knights of Labor and a similar number from the Cigar-makers' International Union of

America on the question of admitting the entire International Union into the Order as a Local Assembly, upon the following basis:

2d. The government of such Local to be upon the system of the present Constitution of the International Union of America.

3d. The present blue label of the International Union shall be designated as the only label to be used for cigars, and all other labels now in use by members of the Order to be abolished.

4th. All Locals not now working similar to and in sympathy with the International Union shall be ordered to surrender their charters, and their members ordered to connect and conform to the system of the new Local thus formed by attaching themselves to its various branches in their respective localities.

5th. The Local Assembly thus formed shall observe the same laws to the general body of the Order as is now observed by other Locals, under the Constitution governing Local Assemblies.

6th. The officers of the new Local to be constituted from the present officers of the Cigar-makers' International Union of America.

7th. The foregoing six points to become law and in full force only upon the proper approval of the same by the organization.

Respectfully,
Fourth Vice-President Cigar-makers' International Union of America.

JOHN S. KIRCHNER,

As an Executive Officer, I hereby testify that the International Union has no connection with any circulars produced before this Board to-day, March 17th. The Board, as such, only has knowledge of one circular bearing upon the present difficulties, and that circular was issued by the President drawing the attention of the members to the attempt of D. A. 49 to counteract the success of our blue label. I desire to emphatically disown Document 1 being issued as a circular by the International President.

[Here reads a letter from the President, which also says this: "They have printed my letter to Powderly without my consent, putting the seal of the International Union on the same."]

As an Executive Officer of a fervent organization which has always been in the front rank for the battle of labor's emancipation—having made immense sacrifices—it is at least entitled to a consideration; and it extremely regrets the probability of being forced to maintain its identity.

Q. BROTHER BAILEY.—Do you or the International Union object to members of the Knights of Labor asking for cigars or other goods bearing the label of the Knights of Labor?

A. Yes; on cigars. The reason we object is that it works mischief and confusion.

Q. Does the International Union consider all shops not under their control scab shops?

A. There is no declaration in the laws of the Union to that effect, although we hold so, and some of us ride as high a horse as,—well as some of —. [Meaning Knights of Labor.]

Q. In reference to those circulars that have been shown you, do you, as an Executive member, discountenance such?

A. I disapprove of them, except Document 2. The reason I approve of Document 2 is because it boycotts the three strike shops.

Q. What do you mean by the interference?

A. This: Where we have a strike conducted under our expense and management, the action of any parties not requested by us is to be considered as an unwarranted interference.

Q. Were those three shops struck by the International Union?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is this letter you read the one you talked about having in your pocket to hurl broadcast, if the Knights of Labor did not accept your terms?

A. Did not use any such language.

Q. Did you say to Brother Hayes, in the Bingham House, Philadelphia, that you had the document in your pocket to declare war unless you got justice?

A. According to the letter in my pocket there will be war, and this is the document, [Doc. 4.] In connection with this I stated to Brother Hayes that I was sorry that the International President was so severe in his letter. Brother Barry said to me, on Eleventh street near Chestnut street, that if we wanted fight they would give us all we wanted.

Q. Did not the International Union attempt to strike thirteen Knights of Labor out of a shop in Philadelphia.

A. International? No.

Q. Did any member of the International Union?

A. The hands working in Gumpert Brothers did strike, in disregard of the By-Laws, against those thirteen people. Those hands were instructed by me not to offer any resistance to those thirteen going to work the next morning.

Q. Were not the thirteen members ordered back by the Executive Board of the Knights of Labor, and you said, after a long discourse: Well, the Gumperts put them back in the morning?

A. Yes; but the hands would not have tolerated it had I not gone to the factory. The International Union bands in the shop struck against those thirteen because they were Progressives, not because they were Knights of Labor, their going into the Order being regarded as a surreptitious move. The membership of the Progressive generally going into the Order I regard as a move to carry over into the Order the old feud existing between the Progressive and the International.

Q. BROTHER GOMPERS.—Does it require a majority of the Executive Board to issue a circular?

A. Yes.

Q. It is the complaint that was made that members of the Order ask only for white-label cigars, is it not?

A. Yes; to all intents and purposes.

The following extract was presented as evidence, page 140, Doc. 21, of the General Assembly Proceedings of 1885:

Appeal dismissed, but recommend the adoption of the following:

That it is the sense of this General Assembly that no Board of Arbitration representing the Knights of Labor should enter into any contract which shall permit the employment of so-called "scab" labor.

On motion, it was voted to adopt the recommendation of the committee.

MONDAY, March 22, 1886.

L. JABLONOWSKI, a witness called for the Progressive Union, testified as follows:

The manufacturers issued a statement to the public asking a readjustment by arbitration. A few days after this was published, a committee of Central Labor Union thought it wise to go up to the manufacturers and ask them if this was a *bona fide* offer. They answered, yes. The committee left. A few days later I received the following letter, [Document 7:]

NEW YORK, January 28, 1886.

Officers of Progressive Union:

GENTS.—On Saturday, January 23, 1886, a committee representing the Central Labor Union of this city called upon the United Cigar Manufacturers in the interest of your Union to inquire whether the request made in the letter to the public, proposing a conference, was a *bona fide* offer. We now inform you, as we informed them, that it was a *bona fide* offer, and we request that you inform us whether you are desirous of meeting us on that subject. By order of the President. JOSEPH OPPENHEIMER, *Secretary U. C. M.*

We called a meeting of the Strike Committee and the Central Labor Union Committee also. After some discussion they concluded to notify the manufacturers that they would go into conference with them. The argument was first brought up, if it would not be wise to invite the International Union to the conference also; but as the matter of Kerbs & Spiess' was still fresh in their minds, and also remembering the fact that the agreement was broken, they resolved not to invite them. The conference was held in the Grand Union Hotel. We consulted and could not come to any understanding. We were standing out at the old prices, and adopted the following resolution, [Document 8:]

WHEREAS, the committee having had no further instructions as to you (the Cigar Manufacturers' Association) to open your shops on the prices paid prior to January 1, 1886, we, as committee, will receive your proposition and report the same to our Union for action.

Signed by the Committee of

CENTRAL LABOR UNION,
CIGAR-MAKERS' PROGRESSIVE UNION.

To this the manufacturers responded by the following, [Document 9:]

Resolved, That a Committee of Five be and is hereby appointed to confer with a committee of the Central Labor Union of New York and the Cigar-makers' Progressive Union No. 1, for the purpose of altering and modifying the present price list, and to report back to this Association for final action. The committee appointed under this resolution are: Messrs. McCoy, B. Lichtenstein, A. Prochaska, B. Newmark and J. Oppenheimer.

This was reported to our Union, and they appointed a Conference Committee to act with the Central Labor Union. The outcome of the next conference was that the bosses were willing to pay 25 cents per thousand on dry mould work; were also willing to make a special price list for fresh work, with increase of wages. This was brought before the Union, as the committee had only power to receive and report. The proposition was not accepted by the Progressive Union. A short time after another conference was called by the bosses, and the result was as follows, [Document 10:]

This agreement, made this 5th day of February, 1886, witnesseth:

1st. This Association pledges itself to open their various factories on the basis of an equalization of the prices as paid prior to January, 1886, in said factories, such equalization to be made as hereinafter specified.

The Progressive and Central Labor Unions shall agree to resume work on such basis, and such agreement shall be made in writing by their proper authorized officers. They shall appoint a committee with power to act in accordance with a committee of this Association, and the Joint Committee thus appointed shall visit the various factories of the members of the National Cigar-makers, and have power to examine pay rolls and price lists; and the prices so obtained shall be collated, and the average of the entire number shall be the established price for the particular class of work under which the various prices are obtained.

2d. Immediately after such average price is obtained, notice shall be served to the manufacturers and the hands that the shops will be opened in accordance therewith for work within twenty-four hours thereafter, to whomsoever of them shall apply for work.

By order of the President.

JOSEPH OPPENHEIMER, *Secretary*.

This was adopted by the Union in a general meeting.

The committee of the Progressive Union and Central Labor Union then went to work on the basis of the old prices paid before January 1st. The new prices were formed, which were adopted by the Union. [Document 11.]

There might be a reduction at some places, but the increase was, in a large majority, as follows, [Document 12:]

	HANDS.	GAIN.	SORTS.	LOSS.	SORTS.
Levy Bros.....	300	0.75	3	2.90	11
McCoy	500		...	7.20	15
Bondy & Lederer.....	300	0.70	4	3.85	9
Ottenberg Bros.....	350	8.10	12		...
Kaufmann Bros.....	150	2.40	8	0.20	3
Brown & Earle.....	300		...	4.60	7
Lichtensteins.....	400	5.50	13	0.15	2
Jacoby & Co.....	425	1.85	8	2.60	6
Heyman Bros.....	150	2.30	8	1.15	3
Brussel & Co.....	100	1.75	7	2.05	6
Levin & Martin.....	200	5.15	10		...
Kaufman, Br. & B.....	300	2.65	7	1.80	5
Sutro & Newmark.....	300	2.15	10	0.15	1
Lies & Co.....	350	1.10	5	2.70	9
		34.30	95	29.35	77

MONDAY, March 22, 1886, 2 o'clock, P. M.

EMIL EMERICH, a witness called for the Progressive Union, testified as follows:

We were appointed by the Central Labor Union to assist the Progressive Union. The committee were: Charles H. Beadlis, H. Sanders, Julius Brenneg, Paul Wilsie and William Merten. The matter was difficult. It took two weeks to find out what to do in the case, there being so many Local Unions. We then decided to go to the Strike Committee of the International Union. We sent a sub-committee, Sanders and myself, with a committee of two from the Progressive. We explained what we were appointed for, and said that when they took any action they should notify us, and when we took any action we would notify them. Brother Gompers made a great speech, and said that they were about to deal with the whole matter themselves, as they felt very confident to handle it. They were glad to see us there, but we should not interfere with them at all. Haller made the same speech that Gompers did. Finally, they allowed us to hear the resolution they had just passed, which said they would call Levy Bros.' shop and Love's shops on strike, and asked the Progressive Union to call out Love's. There was no further action taken that night, and we adjourned until next day. Progressive did not call out Love's shop. They decided to call out Brown & Earle's shop, on the ground that they had as many men in there as the International Union. The same morning we saw in the papers that the International Union called Love's shop on strike, where the Progressive had over five hundred members. Then the Progressive called out Brown & Earle's. Brother Sanders and myself went to their shop meeting to see what they decided about. We met Brother Haller there. He made a very strong speech, and denounced our committee in a notorious manner; but with all that the shop meeting (not all Union) resolved to go on strike by a very large majority.

The reason the Progressive decided to call out Brown & Earle's shop was because they were equally divided, and, if they had to pay strike money, the International Union would have to pay as much as they. Two days after we met the Strike Committee, the International Union broke their agreement with us, in so far as they went to Levy Bros. and had a conference with them, without giving us notice. But a picket of the Progressive found it out and hurried up and went into that meeting. The most which any shop has been dealt with was Kerbs & Spiess'. Their committee (the International Union) made an agreement that should last for a year. There were nearly one hundred Progressive men there. The International called a shop meeting in Leffler's Hall. Quite a hot discussion was going on, and then they went for police. When the police arrived they were all very much excited.

Q. How many police?

A. Four policemen, two detectives and one sergeant; I think that many. They could not keep order. It made them more excited, and they left there and went to the shop and held another meeting in the presence of the bosses and foreman and one dozen police. There were about 250 men to join the International Union. No one was allowed to speak but the bosses and foreman. They had quite a trouble to fill the shop, and had to get other men to fill it. Our committee met again and decided to take some steps to see if we could settle this and bring in the good men from the street, so we decided to go to the Manufacturers' Association. We decided first to go to the International Union, in spite of their breaking the agreement, and invite them to go along to the Manufacturers' Association. They told us that they could not do so—they would have to get higher authority; but that they would give us an answer as soon as possible. But they ignored the invitation, and we have not received any answer yet. Now, just for the sake of those good men, we went to the Manufacturers' Association in the Grand Union Hotel. There was a committee of the Central Labor Union, Progressive, and a member of the Packers' Union. We stated our object, and they were only too glad to see us there. Then the discussion arose upon the price list. We demanded of them that they should open their shops under the old prices, pending a settlement. They refused to do so, and then a price list was made and returned to a vote of the Progressive Union, and was refused. The result of this we reported to the bosses' Association, and that we could not see them any more. If they wanted to see us they must let us know. We received (at least the Progressive did) a letter to come up to the Association, together with our committee. After we went there, and after hours of discussion, we agreed upon another plan—that the Progressive Union report back to the Union, and ask for a committee, with power to act, and that the Manufacturers' Association should do the same. The Progressive Union called a general meeting (the hall was packed) to decide upon this plan. The meeting decided that the committee have power to act and establish an average price list, and the Association was informed of that fact. We started the next morning and commenced with Levy's shop, and went to the fourteen manufacturers and every factory in which there was a Shop Committee. We asked them if they were satisfied with the prices; if they were not, we would correct them. The committee knew the prices, and we found them correct. This way we did for three days. On the fourth day we started to average up the prices, taking the highest to count. The result of it was that in but three shops, in some work, there was a slight reduction, and in all the other shops there was an increase. This average was accepted by both committees, and the Union accepted it. A good many said that this price list was a great advantage to them. Now, the understanding was made in the beginning that the lowest must be not less than \$7, and in that price we raised a good many cases. I compared the price list with the price list of Kerbs & Spiess', and I found, as far as I can calculate, that the list, in many instances, was better than the list of the International Union of Kerbs & Spiess'. This matter was ended, and the trouble in the Central Labor Union came up, and they tried to defeat our price list, but they failed to do it. Then they tried to knock the Progressive Union out of the Central Labor Union, in which they failed also. They tried to bring the International into it, and in that they failed. The price list was accepted by the Central Labor Union.

Q. Who were the Strike Committee?

A. Gompers, Haller and Herman; that I know. Strasser was the director of the Strike Committee.

Q. What did Gompers mean when he said they intended to deal with the matter themselves?

A. That the International Union was the only Union in the cigar-making trade, and that no other trade had anything to say.

Q. You stated the International Union had broken agreement with your Joint Committee?

A. We learned they were holding a secret meeting with Levy Bros. This is a matter of fact.

JACOB WOLF, a witness called for the Progressive, testified as follows:

Q. THE BOARD.—Now please state to this Board the position you held in your Assembly, and the action of the Assembly regarding the present trouble; why you took the cigar-makers into the Order, and when?

A. I am Master Workman of L. A. 2814 since January 1st, 1886. On February 12th the lock-out was declared at an end by the Central Labor Union and Progressive Union of New York, and each man was given notice to go to work. After a week's time the Manufacturers' Association called on the committee of our Local to be present at their meeting at the Grand Union Hotel. They then expressed a wish to obtain a label of the Knights of Labor. They had made a contract with the open Union, which allowed tenement-house work. I, acting as a committee, said we would not go into any transaction unless they abolish the tenement-house system altogether; and further said that, before they could get the label, each and every person in the shop must belong to the Order, and that the Order did not allow children under the age of sixteen years to be taken. The manufacturers then presented me with a resolution that they would agree to give up tenement-house work, and to all further conditions. I presented that to our Local, and it was approved February 18th. [See Minute Book, page 153.] The shops of Levy Bros., McCoy, George P. Leace and Brown & Earle were proposed in our Local on February 25th. [See Minute Book, page 156.] They were balloted for and elected.

Q. Who do you mean by "they were elected?"

A. The cigar and bunch-makers of those shops were taken into our Local, and we handed the propositions of all the other work-people to the Locals of their trade. At a special meeting, February 26th, [see Minute Book, page 158,] the cigar and bunch-makers of McCoy's shop answered the requirements of the Order and were admitted, there being 248 members. On February 27th, [see Minute Book, page 158,] the cigar and bunch-makers of Levy's shop were admitted after answering all requirements, there being 278 members. On March 1st, at a special meeting, [see Minute Book, page 159,] 134 cigar and bunch-makers from Brown & Earle's shop were admitted as members.

Q. Were all those whom you had taken in as members up to this time the ones who were proposed on February 18th?

A. They were; yes, sir. After the lock-out was at an end, the Central Labor Union and Progressive had equalized the prices in the shops, but at the same time had allowed the tenement-house work to exist, showing us that the proper time had come to abolish the tenement-house and child-labor systems, which the Unions had been unable to do, although trying twelve years. We thought it wise for our Local to receive the applications for membership from the workmen of the different shops. We proposed, elected and initiated them strictly according to the laws of our Order, and have accomplished through that the abolishment of the tenement-house system of eleven manufacturers in the Association, as well as child labor; and also got each and every workman in said factories up to the men organized in their respective trade Locals, after we had the stronghold on those fourteen manufacturers. We first compelled those fourteen (instead of tenement-house cheap floors) to pay, at the lowest rate, \$7.

Q. What was the price paid in the tenement houses previously?

A. From \$5.65 to \$6.15. We then started for the outside manufacturers, after resolving in our Local not to allow any more cheap floors, but only one factory price. [See page 171, Minute Book, March 14th, 1886.] And we succeeded in getting the formerly lowest-paid shops and tenement houses up to the standard shop price. In all these efforts we were successful, but at the same time were hindered by the action of the International Union.

Q. You mean to say that all this took place after the lock-out was settled by the Central Labor Union and Progressive?

A. Yes; and even mean to say that each and every member of our Local was fully convinced that there was no further trouble between the employers and employees of those three shops, as the prices were equalized. [Charges against L. A. 2458: See Document 1, charges; see Document 2, the report of the Committee of Arbitration and Strikes of D. A. 49.]

Thomas Davis, Robert Kleinfeld, J. Summerfield and Jacob Wolf, working at No. 430 Grand street, raised the price of our work from \$7 to \$8, when all were discharged, under a pretence that the manufacturer would not work any more seed goods. Then the International Union stepped in, giving the privilege to make this work for \$7.50, and making it an International Union shop. When we heard of the reopening of the shop we called for work, but were told we had to be International Union men, or could not get any work.

Q. How do you know they made this agreement?

A. I was told that as I worked there so long he would give me a job, but I must become a member of International Union. At the Upman shop the officers of International Union also made an agreement, through which about ten of our members lost their job. I called as a committee there, and the superintendent told me that he had nothing against the Knights of Labor, but they must be International Union. At Hirschhorn's, a small store or factory, a brother by the name of Froderman was working for three years, but was struck out because he would not become an International Union man.

PHILIP MIRSKY, a witness called for the Knights of Labor, testified as follows:

I am working in Foster, Hilson & Co.'s; cigar-maker—a Spanish hand-worker; am a member of the Knights of Labor for about six months, and also of the International Union since December last. About five weeks ago the boss came up and called for the shop President of the International Union, and said he would like to see the shop made an International Union one. A week after, on Saturday, every one was forced to join the International Union; and on Monday he sent away all his hands, but told them to come back in a few hours for their money. When he gave out the money he asked each of them if he was a member of the International Union, and said they could work if they were. On the Saturday after this the Secretary of the shop came around and asked everybody for his address, and some of the workmen asked him what for. So he gave them to understand that he had got orders from the International Union. On the Monday after this the boss came up in the shop and called out the shop President, and told him that he would like to see the shop a Knights of Labor shop. The President said he would try to do it, and he went away and brought the list of all the names he took a few days before. Then he talked to the workmen, telling them they were all proposed in the Knights of Labor. I asked him if that was the reason he took the names on Saturday. He said yes. I asked him why he did not tell me on Saturday what for. "How do you know that they are not members of the Knights?" "Well," said he, "I know you are a member, and I know so many are belonging to the Knights." He said if I would scratch everybody who belonged, he would give me the list. He told the other workmen, who did not belong to the Knights, that they had to give him 50 cents on Saturday. To some of them, friends of mine, I said if they wanted to be proposed in L. A. 2814, and gave me their names, I would propose them.

After he knew I belonged to L. A. 2814 he did not call a shop meeting. The shop President of the International Union, Lewis Mock, and two more of the International Union, stood at the door and told each one that if they did not pay 50 cents they could not work any more. He only succeeded with those who could not understand what he meant, and ordered them to 295 Bowery. He initiated on Sunday, the next day. About thirty men were taken in at that time, and the most of them did not know that this Assembly did not belong to D. A. 49. When I found this out I went to the President and asked him to call a shop meeting to explain to the people about the Knights of Labor. He called the shop meeting, and he told them he didn't believe that honest men would belong to D. A. 49, for only scabs belonged to that District Assembly. Those that wanted to be honest would join the Defiance Assembly, No. 2458. After this I took the floor, and said I would see him about this, when he called D. A. 49 a scab. I was here not as an International Union man; I was a member of the Knights, and was talking in the interest of the Order. We should have nothing to do with a trade union. When we were all members of the Knights, we did not belong to any trade union. Everybody could belong to the Knights of Labor without being in any trade union. Then the President called me to order about this. I said they were not bound to belong to any trade union when they belonged to the Knights. There was a charge made against me in the International Union about this. I went last Tuesday, 22d of March, to the Board meeting. I heard the report of the Strike Committee, and they said: "We need one more man now to go out and agitate for the blue label. Brother Haller is in the South, Brother Gompers went West, and we will send Kirchner East. They can go into all the Assemblies. We have \$4,000 over from strike fund of ten per cent. from the wages, paid about four weeks ago. A new assessment of 25 cents per member is to be paid in eight weeks to advertise in the daily for the blue label."

LEWIS ZEIGER, a witness called for the Knights of Labor, testified as follows:

I am a manufacturer myself at 233 East 29th street, New York. Mr. Frederick, proprietor of the hall, 295 Bowery, said to me: "I had a h——l of a trouble yesterday about the cigars."

Q. How long ago?

A. About five weeks. I asked him what the trouble was. He said they were not fighting about the cigars, but they didn't want the white label, so they requested him to get rid of the white label and put the blue on top of it. He would not give me any name, so I went there last Sunday, March 20th. I found one man of L. A. 2458 there, but no cigars of any one's but Straiton & Storm's. I spoke to some men there about going against my cigars, as I had eight children, and it was not fair to go against my cigars. The young fellow of the Defiance said: "We don't care; we want the blue label." I think there should be some protection given me from this boycotting. I have been a member of the Knights of Labor for five years. L. A. 2458 meets in this hall, and the members of that Assembly will not allow the white label sold in that building.

Ross, a witness, testified as follows:

I worked in Louis Ash's shop; I am a roller; I was getting \$7 per 1,000; after it was made an International Union shop the price was \$6.10.

Q. How long ago was this?

A. About three weeks ago.

Q. Are you a member of the International Union?

A. No.

Q. Are you still working in this shop?

A. No; I was discharged because I would not join the International Union. The boss said he would pay my fees to join the International Union.

Q. Are you a member of the Knights of Labor?

A. Yes.

Q. How long have you been a member?

A. Three weeks.

A. FANCE, a witness called for the Knights of Labor, testified as follows:

I work in Ash's shop; am a bunch-maker. I was getting \$3.50 per 1,000 until the shop was made an International shop, when the price was cut to \$3.25.

Q. How long ago was this?

A. About three weeks ago.

Q. Are you a member of the International Union?

A. No; and I was discharged because I would not join them.

Q. Are you a member of the Knights of Labor?

A. Yes.

Q. How long have you been a member?

A. Three weeks.

L. JABLINOWSKI, a witness for the Progressive Union, testified that a sub-committee of both the Central Labor Union and International Union called on the Progressive Union. It was then agreed not to take any steps in the matter without notifying other parties. Friday, January 15th, two days later, without giving any notice, the International Committee independently called on Levy Bros. There had been a strike ordered in the mean time by the International in Levy Bros., and in Brown & Earle's by the Progressive, as in both shops both organizations were evenly represented. We don't know why the International called on Levy Bros.; we didn't know their intention. A few days later, Strasser, Herman and Haller called on Mr. Oppenheimer to offer to make the same agreement that Kerbs & Spiess had done. After the lock-out had occurred they made a kind of contract with Kerbs & Spiess, which threw out 80 of our members, (Progressives,) and 300 non-union people, as they did not want to be forced into the International. After the lock-out had lasted three weeks and all this had been done, and our contract made with the International had been broken by the International, we received notice from the Manufacturers' Association that they would be willing to settle, and offered 25 cents per 1,000, in addition to the price list issued on the 1st of January by the Manufacturers' Association; also, agreeing to organize full Union shop. This offer was refused by vote of the Progressive Union. While all this was going on, the International Union representatives in the Central Labor Union refused to recognize the Progressive as a *bona fide* Union. After fourteen days' time they (the International) were expelled from the Central Labor Union. Then another call came from the Manufacturers' Association to meet them, (the Progressive and Central Labor Union.) Not knowing if the International was invited or not, sent word to the Packers' Executive Board of the open Union. This conference with the Manufacturers' Association took place on February 5th. Then they offered the Progressive and Central Labor Union to have a uniform price list on the rates being paid before January 1st, but no cigar should be made below \$7. This was put before the Union, and by a very large majority was received. The committee of Progressive and Central Labor Union then took three days and a half to make out the equal price, taking the books, pay rolls, as well as consulting with a Shop Committee of each shop, and the final result was this price list. [See Doc. 11.] The manufacturers agreed to make Union shops work nine hours to May, and from May eight hours. This settled the lock-out between the cigar manufacturers and the workmen. As to each man who had worked previous to January 1st, his job was secured if he would call within twenty-four hours. The Cigar-makers' International Union, seeing that they were losing ground, readily accepted the increase of wages in other shops, (eleven in num-

ber.) For the sake of equalization of the wages in Levy Bros., Brown & Earle's, and McCoy's, prices had been reduced a little. They (the International) declared those the shops on strike. The strike being settled for the members of Progressive No. 1, they went to work because they were assured there was no actual reduction, only an equalization of wages, as there is no decrease on the average earnings throughout the whole fourteen shops. They then tried to keep the packers away from those three shops. All people working there were doing so by the consent of their organization and the Central Labor Union.

Q. What proportion of the workmen in those three shops were Progressive?

A. In Brown & Earle's, about 150 out of 300.

Q. What amount of the employees were non-union men?

A. 100.

Q. What amount in Levy's were Progressive men?

A. Out of 300 we had about 50, the International 70, the balance non-union. In McCoy's we had 120 Progressive, 45 International, and 400 non-union.

Q. Who pasted up those notices you spoke of?

A. After the usual day off at Christmas and New Year's, to take account of stock for their report, the men upon returning to work found, to their astonishment, a price list hung upon the walls of the sixteen shops, made by the manufacturers themselves, headed: "To better the condition of the workingmen." The price list being a great reduction of the prices paid previous to January 1st, the Cigar-makers' Progressive Union decided not to receive the price list presented by the Manufacturers' Association, and to strike—the Progressive declaring the strike in Brown & Earle's factory, and the International Union in Levy's. The Manufacturers' Association then, several days after the strike in the two shops, hung up another notice in the balance of the shops, (14 in number,) declaring that on and after a certain date their shops would be locked up if the men in the two respective shops did not go to work.

Q. How do you know the committee of the International went to Levy Bros.?

A. After agreeing to act together at a late hour one evening, (half-past eleven o'clock,) a newspaper reporter called at the office of the Progressive Union and informed us there would be a meeting to-morrow, the 15th of January, at Levy Bros.' In consequence of this the Progressive put out a picket and saw the International Committee going in, and after the picket saw them go into Levy Bros.' informed our Executive Committee, which went in also.

Q. How do you know that the International Union attempted to enter into a compact with the Manufacturers' Association detrimental to the Progressive Union and others?

A. Because we knew they struck our members out of Kerbs & Spiess' two days before the lock-out took place; and they had no right whatever by the agreement to see any of the firms as a separate body; they also deny having been in Mr. Oppenheimer's house, which we prove is false by the following affidavit:

STATE OF NEW YORK, CITY AND COUNTY OF NEW YORK, ss.:

JOSEPH OPPENHEIMER, being duly sworn on his oath, deposes and says:

I am personally acquainted with Messrs. Strasser, Haller and Herman, who are officers and members of the International Cigar-makers' Union. That on either the 21st or 22d day of January, 1886, I cannot say positively whether the 21st or 22d, but I do say positively that on either the one or the other of said days, in the evening of said day, at about eight o'clock, the hall door-bell of my residence, No. 169 East 70th Street, New York City, was rung, and I, happening to be in the hall at the time, opened the door. I found the said Strasser, Haller and Herman on my door step. They entered my house, taking off their hats and overcoats in the hall and depositing the same on the hat rack, and then, in response to my invitation, they entered the library or reception-room on the parlor floor of said house, and were seated there and remained there with me for a portion of the time, in the

presence of my wife, Tillie Oppenheimer, to whom they were introduced on her entering the room in which we were, and stayed there until they (the said Strasser, Haller and Herman) left my house, which was between the hours of 11 and 12 o'clock, or about midnight of said day.

During said time the said three named gentlemen drank wine and smoked cigars which I furnished to them. The attendance of these gentlemen at my house on this occasion was in pursuance of an appointment made through Mr. Louis Hass, of the firm of Kerbs & Spiess, New York City. I further say that I know the three named gentlemen, have often met them, and, on my positive oath, do allege and assert emphatically and without the slightest reservation that said meeting took place at my house, and that any statement of denial to the contrary is false and untrue.

The foregoing affidavit is true on my oath and on my honor as a man.

JOSEPH OPPENHEIMER.

Sworn before me this 17th day of February, 1886.

MORRIS S. WISE, *Notary Public, New York County.*

Q. Was the settlement of this strike and lock-out effected previous to the workingmen of those three shops joining the Knights of Labor?

A. Yes, sir. And as the Progressive and the other Union could not do away with the tenement-house work, we called on the Knights of Labor to help us. We received from the manufacturers the following, agreed to by their Association:

NEW YORK, February 25, 1886.

Resolved, That this Association agrees to give up the tenement-house system; *provided*, that those now working under that system shall be allowed to open a separate floor, wherein the prices for cigars made shall be \$7 per 1,000 for all from 4 inches up to and including 4½ inches, and \$7.50 for all above 4½ inches up to and including 5 inches. And the Association further agrees that not over one-third of the product of the factories shall be made on this specified separate floor; *provided further*, that by such action they shall become entitled to and shall obtain the Knights of Labor labels for all goods of their production so soon thereafter as all the persons in their employ shall have been made members of the Order of the Knights of Labor.

JOSEPH OPPENHEIMER, *Secretary U. C. M.*

We thereupon organized those three shops into the Knights of Labor.

Our intention, when the bosses put up the price list, was to be united in this struggle, although the International and Progressive were fighting. To prove that, the Executive Board of Union No. 1, in executive meeting, held on Sunday, January 3d, 8, P. M., instructed me, as Secretary of the Union, to write to all Local Unions of the International Union comprising the city of New York (except the Packers' International Union of the city, No. 213, which is a scab organization) the following letter: [See page 5.]

This was sent to the following: International Union of New York City and Union No. 13; Charles D. Schuelzer, No. 144; M. Dampf, Secretary of Packers' Independent Union No. 2; Julius Brenning, No. 141; Edward Snyder, No. 10; and Fred. Haller, who was made Secretary of the International Union on the same evening. He was the previous National Secretary of the Progressive. This was written Jan. 4th. At that time the lock-out was not declared, nor was the strike. From all this correspondence our Union did not receive any answers, except from International Union No. 10. [See page 5.]

The others did not answer it at all. Two days before the lock-out a shop meeting of Kerbs & Spiess' was called, on account of the foreman stating it should be an International shop. The Progressive Union had in this shop 80 members, and there was one International, the rest being non-union. Forschner and L. Jablinowski, representing the Progressive, Strasser, Gompers, Haller and L. Berliner, representing the International Union, were present. The International were trying to convince those people that it was for their benefit to join the International Union, for the day before an agreement was made with the

firm that this shop should be an International Union shop, which means, *none shall work there unless they are members of the International Union*. They were disappointed by seeing that they favored the Progressive instead, if they were compelled to join any. The speaker of the Progressive argued for the International not to throw the firebrand, by throwing 80 Progressive members out of employment, on the eve of this trouble. But their future action showed they did not care for it, as the shop was organized anyhow by the aid of the police, and *the firm advancing the entrance fee for the members*, and the 80 men were fired out. 300 non-union people declined to join the International Union, and also went on strike with the Progressive. By this unwise action 80 men were thrown out in the middle of winter, and the Union had to support them. This action of the International Union caused a bitter feeling against them, since which time an advertisement has appeared in the *U. S. Tobacco Journal* making Kerbs & Spiess' an International Union shop.

None of those 80 men went back except those who were forced to join the International Union to save their positions. This is to show how we were treated when we were attempting to act in unison with them. The International Union was also aware that, according to the Constitution of the Progressive Union, this meant paying to each of those 80 men \$5 a week, and also to support the non-union members. This was a terrible burden on the members of the Union on the eve of a lock-out. The purpose was clear to us, to clean out our treasury so that any settlement made with the bosses would make an International Union shop. Kaufmann Bros.' shop, on Third Avenue, also belonged to the Manufacturers' Association, and hung up the price list; but the men, who are mostly Progressive Union men, struck and made application for strike to the Union. While the application was pending, the International Union, without giving us any notice whatever, declared Love's shop, which is a strict Progressive Union shop, comprising 500 members, entitled to benefit. This means \$2,500 a week out of our treasury. [See Progressive Constitution, Article VI, Section 2, page 7.] Thereby another attack was made to ruin us financially; but this trick was prevented by our people remaining at work. The situation became more clear to the Progressive Union. It meant that the intention of the International Union was not to fight against the bosses, but really to take every opportunity to crush out of existence the Progressive Union. The shop of Love's was therefore not *ordered on strike by the Progressive Union*, but *the Executive of our Union ordered Brown & Earle's shop on strike, where a majority of our people were working*. In this shop members of the International Union were working. We supported all the members we took out, costing \$600 a week. To the 80 men of Kerbs and Spiess' we paid \$5 a week, and to the non-union married men \$3, and to the single men \$2.50. We still had a tenement-house strike on our hands of 110 men, costing \$550 a week. The International Union ordered Levy Bros.' shop on strike, where we had 45 or 50 men, without giving us notice at all. This was a day previous to our Executive Committee ordering out Brown & Earle's shop. Fred. Haller did his utmost in the shop meeting of Brown & Earle's to persuade the men not to go out, but only referring to Love's shop that *they* should go out. The Central Labor Union Committee in one of the meetings adopted a proposition made by a member of Central Labor Union Committee before ever the lock-out began, or before any strike was in force by either one of the Unions, that due notice must be given to both parties of all the actions which should be done by either one of the Unions. This meant a conference with the manufacturers on ordering strikes in any of the shops. We, as Progressive Union, gave our promise to do so and kept it. Two days after this promise was made to the Central Labor Union Committee, Messrs. Emerich, Sanders and Füsse, of the Progressive, a conference took place in the office of Levy Bros.' No committee either of the Central Labor Union or ours got any notice of this conference, but while our Executive was in session a reporter came into our office

working for news. He stated that a conference would be held to-morrow in Levy Bros.' office. This was reported to the Executive immediately, and they, fearing that the outcome between the manufacturers and the International Union would not benefit the Progressive Union, and as it was a violation of their agreement made with us, appointed a committee to use every means to take part in this conference by appointing a picket, whose duty it was to watch those who went into the factory. Our committee was placed in a saloon opposite Levy's factory, at ten o'clock in the morning. The members of the International Strike Committee appeared, and a private room in the saloon was rented for them. About twenty-five minutes after ten o'clock the committee of the International Union went from this room to Levy's office. Our picket immediately came over notifying us that they went in, and our committee then followed them to that office and took part in the conference. We believe that if we had not come into this conference the matter would have been settled against us, as it was done in Kerbs & Spiess'. At the close of the conference the manufacturers stated they would meet that afternoon in Grand Union Hotel and decide. Gompers stepped up and said: "Well, Haller and Herman will be there, and you can tell them your decision." Then I said: "I am representing the Progressive Union, and I will be there also." This shows over again that they ignored us wherever they could, even in the presence of the manufacturers. The decision was that if Levy's shop would not resume work or have as many hands as they needed to run the factory, a lock-out would be declared within three days. By the influence of one of the International Unions, (No. 10,) the Strike Committee wrote a letter inviting us to their meeting. We appointed a committee to go there, with the instruction that we should act with the International Union to make this fight a success, providing the trouble existing between our Union and the International Union in the shop of Kerbs & Spiess' be settled in future so that a Union shop should consist of Union men, irrespective of what Union they belonged to. They refused that, saying that that went beyond their Constitution. Mr. Haller was the main leader in bringing up this argument, thereby enlarging the split. We then went home and made up our minds to fight those manufacturers, but we were also aware of the enemy we had in the International Union.

THURSDAY, March 25, 1886.

J. WOLF, a witness called for the Knights of Labor, testified as follows:

Last night Mr. Bliss called on me and complained that he was not yet a member, as other people who had given their names after him to L. A. 2458 were members already. The time elapsing from the time I received the name was eight days. There were two men from Shortwell's shop. The boss had wanted his shop to organize in the Knights of Labor, and the International Union collected 50 cents from each man in the shop. Yesterday, when those two asked them when they would hear from the Knights of Labor, they were told to bring another 50 cents, as the first 50 cents was for the International Union, and that they could not be a Knight of Labor unless they were International Union.

I was invited, about March 1st, to call at a meeting at Rose Hill Hall, Second avenue, of the International Strippers' and Bookers' Union, to explain to them that they could only join the Order through their trade Local—the Good-will Association. We could not get the floor. The others—Gompers and the Master Workman of L. A. 2458, Dampi—then declared openly that they would not care for anybody in the whole Order, but take in anybody working in a cigar factory in this Local, (2458.)

Brother McGuire, District Master Workman, notified them there was a trade Local, and they must go into it. At a public meeting on Fourth street, in Everett, Sunday, about the first of this month, Strasser, Haller and Gompers addressed the meeting and denounced D. A. 49 and L. A. 2814 as composed of scabs; and said that the Knights of Labor were mixed in the International Union, and that the general Order would have to denounce their actions.

NEW YORK, March 30, 1886.

JACOB WOLF, called in behalf of the Knights of Labor, made the following statement: I received a letter last night, the 29th, from Lichtenstein Bro. & Co., complaining that their goods are boycotted in the *Pacific Boycotter* as tenement-house cigars; and at the same time he gave me notice that he had considerable loss through that, and the result would be he would have to discharge considerable hands. I wish you would aid me some regarding that. This is a strict Knights of Labor shop, and does not employ any more tenement-house workers whatever. In fact, we have not a cigar made outside of this factory in any tenement house, no matter what may be said to the contrary. I will also state that no manufacturers' employees would be received by the Knights of Labor, of this city, until they had signed an agreement with our organization that they would forever give up tenement-house labor on cigars.

From Newark, New Jersey, I also received notice from the firm of Bondy & Lederer, who manufacture in this city, New York, which is also a strict Knights of Labor shop under the same agreement in reference to tenement-house work as the one above mentioned, that their goods are being boycotted by the members of our Order in Newark, New Jersey, without saying that, as the Knights of Labor of Newark, N. J., they want the blue label of the International Union. In proof of the above, we will refer you to the following-named jobber: William Wolf, Market street, Newark, N. J. And such notices I am in receipt of every day, wherein complaints are made that members of our Order are being used to boycott cigars bearing the white label of the Knights of Labor, by the false statements of the representatives of the International Union that the said goods were the products of scab factories and tenement houses, and in consequence of which great suffering is enforced upon members of the Knights of Labor who are employed in the cigar-making trade; and should this continue, it will compel the members of our organization, for self-preservation, to withdraw from the Knights of Labor and become attached to the International Cigar-makers' Union that they may have an opportunity to live.

I wish to make a further statement, that on March 29th I received this letter, which I hand to you, with the following statement from the firm named in the letter: That, when he expressed a desire to have their factory organized as a Knights of Labor shop, an employee of theirs, having heard that he had sent for Mr. Wolf, said that he would take the names of said employees and have them made Knights of Labor. The firm, not knowing of the existing trouble between the general Order and L. A. 2458, accepted the proposition of this one man. That now, after the shop was organized, a committee of L. A. 2458 calls on the firm, telling them that the white label was not of any account without the blue label attached. They must now make their factory an International Union shop also.

The firm of B. A. Shotwell objected to that, and called at my office last night to find out if I could do anything for him. And it is plain to be seen that the only interest that L. A. 2458 has is to advance the interest of the International Cigar-maker' Union, in evidence of which I will call your attention to a paper, published and edited by members of L. A. 2458 and the International Union, wherein they call for the boycott of all the cigars not bearing the blue label of the International Cigar-makers' Union. The title of said paper is *The Picket*, a weekly, edited by Samuel Gompers.

I would here submit a card of a member who is credited with being initiated March 17th, 1886, but who is willing to make affidavit that she was never inside of the Assembly room, nor received any form of initiation, or has any knowledge whatever of the Knights of Labor. I am also prepared to bring several cases similar to the one above mentioned.

Have also received a request from Simon Merzbach, of No. 743 Third avenue, New York, asking to have his factory organized as a Knights of Labor shop, that he might use our label, he claiming that the label of the International Union, which he has, is not a sufficient recommendation of his cigars. Upon investigation, I find that the prices paid in this shop, which is an International shop, are from \$1 to a \$1.50 less than is paid under the agreement of the Knights of Labor, made by factories that have become strictly Knights of Labor shops, which is conclusive proof that the International Union have no regular or equal scale of prices for goods or for cigars made in this city, there being a difference of from \$1 to \$1.50 paid in the various shops.

DAVID SOMMER, a witness called for the Knights of Labor, testified as follows:

I am a cigar-maker in the firm of Sutro & Newmark, and have belonged to L. A. 2814 about five months. Some of my friends requested me to propose them in the Assem-

bly, (2814,) but four days later they came to me and told me to take them off the list. I asked them why, but they did not answer me satisfactorily, and so I let the matter drop until Saturday, when I heard rumors going around that we were going to be railroaded, and that they were going to be initiated on Sunday. To convince myself, I found out where they were to meet, and at two o'clock went to their meeting-room with the intention to be present at their meeting. I went into the meeting of L. A. 2458 and waited until the meeting was opened. They came around to take the pass-word, and I was called over to the Master Workman, when he told me I could not remain in their meeting. But while in the room I saw members of L. A. 2814 who were expelled by that Local, and as I went out of the meeting I saw all of those who gave me their names only four days before, and I know they only gave their names to L. A. 2458 two or three days before the meeting. I also wish to say that I began to work in Kerbs & Spiess' shop a few days before the lock-out. When I had been working about a week, the International Union came to me and said I would have to join it. They said it made no difference, I had to join the International Union. I ordered to keep my job, I joined. So afterwards when they were trying to organize the shop into a Knights of Labor, and found out that I was a member of L. A. 2814, they would not let me work by giving me bad work, and so I had to leave.

Q. Who told you that you must join the International Union?

A. The shop President, the Secretary of the International Union, and the foreman.

Q. Are you a member of the International Union yet?

A. No, sir; only while I was in the shop.

Q. Did you ever visit a meeting of the International Union?

A. No, sir. When I went to the shop meeting of the International Union, I was expelled because I would not pay strike benefits to strike against members of L. A. 2814. I was a member four weeks then, and had paid one dollar. [See International Receipt Book, Doc. 1.]

H. FRODERMAN, a witness called for the Progressive Union, testified as follows:

I work in a store on the Bowery. About seven men were working there one day when the boss came and asked for labels, because his customers wanted cigars with labels. I said I would bring labels from the Progressive Union. I brought them. The next week he came again and said he didn't want those red labels; he wanted the blue label. I told him the boss labels were the Knights of Labor labels. He asked me if I was a member of the Knights of Labor. I said yes; and then he asked me if he could get those labels. I said yes, if all the men who make the cigars were Knights of Labor. For a few days he said nothing to me; then he sent the foreman to me and asked me if I had decided to go into the International Union. I said no; I was a member of the Knights of Labor, and did not want to join the International Union. I was then at the time discharged for not going into the International Union. The boss said to them: "Men, it is a G—d—shame if I must discharge a man who has worked for me three years on account of the International Union."

Q. Who were the members of the International Union who requested your discharge?

A. M. Cohen and H. Grings.

Q. How long have you been a member of the Knights of Labor?

A. About three years.

Q. Do you know if either of these two men were Knights of Labor?

A. Yes; H. Grings was a member of L. A. 2814.

N. THIELEN, a witness called for the Knights of Labor, testified as follows:

I am a cigar-maker, working in Love's shop, and Secretary of L. A. 2814. On February 20th, 1886, I notified L. A. 2458 that we had charges against Bernard Davis, Oscar Gitne, Fred. Haller and H. Dimand; and, on March 8th, Brother Davis, in the presence of two members, said he was a member of L. A. 2458.

Q. What were the charges, and were they presented to the members?

A. For betraying the business of our Local. They were suspended by the Local at full meeting, with all members of the Court present, pending trial, as we had no time to take up the matter then. [See Minutes.]

J. P. OPPENHEIMER, of Levy Bros., states positively he knew of jobbers in this city who were selling tenement-house cigars, and always held large packages of the International Cigar-makers' Union labels, which they used to put on boxes for those of their customers who demanded Union-made goods. Those labels were given by parties who held the labels for the Union, and for a consideration—cannot say how much.